

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS: W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D., Perse School House, Cambridge.
A. D. GODLEY, M.A., 27 Norham Road, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., *Chairman.*

W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.*

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. GILBERT MURRAY,
LL.D., D.Litt. F.B.A., F.R.S.L.
Prof. C. FLAMSTEAD
WALTERS, M.A.

With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*
Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; Principal Sir W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., University of Melbourne.

Vol. XXXI

DECEMBER, 1917

No. 8

CONTENTS

| ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS: | PAGE | SHORT NOTICES: | PAGE |
|------------------------------------------------------|------|-----------------------------------------------------|------|
| The Homeric Hymns. X. T. L. AGAR .. | 185 | <i>Seneca's Tragedies.</i> A. D. G. .. | 201 |
| The Cyrillus Glossary and Others. W. M. LINDSAY .. | 188 | OBITUARY: | |
| Verse Composition in Schools. A. D. G. .. | 193 | Professor JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE .. | 202 |
| REVIEWS: | | A. E. CODD .. | 203 |
| Livingstone's <i>Defence of Classical Education.</i> | | NOTES AND NEWS .. | 204 |
| W. RHYS ROBERTS .. | 196 | Epitaph on an Army of Mercenaries. J. M. EDMONDS .. | 204 |
| Plautus. E. A. SONNENSCHN .. | 199 | CORRESPONDENCE .. | 204 |
| | | BOOKS RECEIVED .. | 204 |

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
BOSTON, MASS.: GINN & COMPANY, 15, ASHBURTON PLACE.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. net; U.S.A., 30 cents net. Yearly Subscription (Eight Numbers), 7s. 6d., Post Free. U.S.A., \$2.00 net.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public, viz. 7s. 6d. for the *Classical Review*, 12s. 6d. for the *Classical Quarterly*, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed either to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. Williamson, 46, Park Road, Pendleton, Manchester; or to the Acting Hon. Secretary, Professor Slater, 4, Chalcot Gardens, London, N.W. 3; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss M. A. B. Herford, The University, Manchester; Miss M. W. U. Robertson, The University, Edmund Street, Birmingham; Mr. Kenneth Forbes, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss Wilkinson, Badminton House, Clifton, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. Strudwick, M.A., City of London School for Girls, Carmelite Street, E.C. 4.; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. P. W. Dodd, The University, Leeds; and Mrs. R. M. Gray, 13, Marine Lines, Bombay.

HORACE AND HIS AGE. A Study in Historical

Background. By the Rev. J. F. D'ALTON, M.A., D.D., Professor of Ancient Classics, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Crown 8vo. 6s. net.

"An intimate study of Horace, and a valuable treatise on the philosophy, social life, folk-lore, and literature of the Augustan Age."—*Glasgow Herald*.

VIRGIL AND LUCRETIVS.

Passages translated by WILLIAM STEBBING, Hon. Fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. Crown 8vo. 4s. 6d. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., 39, Paternoster Row, LONDON, E.C. 4.

Latin.—AD LIMEN.

By PROFESSORS WALTERS and CONWAY.

2s. 6d.

A new book of Translation and Composition for Matriculation Students.

Greek.—DEIGMA.

By PROFESSORS WALTERS and CONWAY, assisted by Miss C. I. DANIEL.

3s. 6d.

Contains all the grammatical essentials for ordinary reading.

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE ST., W. 1.

BOOKS

FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C. 2.

The Classical Review

DECEMBER, 1917

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

X.

I NOW turn to the Hymn to Apollo, of which the text, though not depending on one MS. only, as does the Hymn to Demeter, is hardly in better condition.

20 πάντῃ γάρ τοι, Φοῖβε, νομὸς βεβλήταί ῥ' ᾠδῆς.

So the MSS. except that νόμος (L μόνος) is the accentuation. In point of epic diction and grammar Ilgen's νομοὶ βεβλήτα' αἰοδῆς, adopted wisely by Gemoll, may be considered the minimum of requisite and necessary change. Allen and Sikes surpass themselves in an extraordinary defence of the singular noun. They say, in effect, that because Aristarchus very strongly objected to ἐπιστέαται (Zenod.) in Π 243, which no editor is ever likely to adopt, and because in γ 438 several MSS. idly read an impossible κεχαροίατ' ἰδοῦσα, and one MS. an equally absurd βεβλήταται in Α 660, 'it is therefore possible that νομὸς βεβλήταται may be correct.' I draw a very different conclusion.

So also ᾠδῆς is defended, but only in a Pickwickian sense, by the formula found in *Hymn. Dem.* 494-5 = XXX. 18-9, where it may well have succeeded in displacing an obsolescent

πρόφρων δ' ἀντ' ὀλμης (cf. θ 74).

The suggested emendations of βεβλή-
ται are numerous, but not very satis-
factory or convincing. Yet it is difficult
to extract any quite appropriate sense
from βάλλω here. The latest translator,
Mr. Evelyn-White, has 'the whole range
of song is fallen to you,' which suggests
the casting of lots. Allen and Sikes
give their approval to 'lay (as a founda-
tion)' again in connection with 'range,'
which suggests building and brick-

setting. Gemoll says 'the fields spread
out,' i.e. βάλλεσθαι = κείσθαι. None of
these views seem acceptable. I there-
fore venture to make a new suggestion,
which is based on α 155 and θ 266.

ἦ τοι ὁ φορμίζων ἀνεβάλλετο καλὸν αἰδεῖν. . . .

Cf. Pind. *Pyth.* I, 6 ὅπῳταν προσιμίων
ἀμβολὰς τεύχῃς.

The loss of ἀνα- in our line I attribute
to the ever-operative desire to avoid an
elision. I suggest then

πάντῃ γάρ τ' ἀνα, Φοῖβε, νόμοι βεβλήτα' αἰοδῆς.

In this there is no far-fetched meta-
phor, but simply the slightly technical
language of the singer with his lyre
(φόρμυγξ):

For everywhere, O Phoebus, strains of song are
raised to do thee honour.

This runs smoothly and harmoniously
with the preceding question and with
the line that follows:

ἦ μὲν ἀν' ἡπειρον πορτιτρόφον ἦδ' ἀνὰ νήσους.

We should then proceed directly to
l. 25, for the importation of 144-5 here,
even with the added charm of l. 24, is
clearly inappropriate, and probably the
work of a foolish rhapsodist bent on
filling up the physical geography of
l. 21 with ornate but misplaced detail.

27 Δῆλῳ ἐν ἀμφιρέτῃ; ἐκάτερθε δὲ κύμα κελαυνὸν
ἐξῆι χέρσουδε λιγυπνοῖσι ἀνέμοισιν.

The statement is peculiar. 'Εξῆι,
exibat, 'went out,' misrepresents, or
rather reverses that most familiar of
sights on the shore in a high wind.
The breakers invariably roll in, and the
phenomenon continues thus on every
shore to this day and for ever. The
verb is therefore untenable. Is any
restoration here possible? Well, I do

not think it is hopeless. The poet is not to be held responsible for the situation. The tradition only is at fault. The true reading seems partly indicated by the variant given in a most important group of MSS. Allen's χ (= E L' Π T) *ἐξείει*. The suggestion is that we have a corruption of

ἐξειεν

'foamed.' The top of each wave breaks into white foam as it races towards the shore *χέρσονδε*. With *ζέω* and *ζείω* compare *χέω*, *χείω* v. *Homeric* i 205-10. I find also in the fragments of the *Eoiai* of Hesiod 96, ii. 95 (Rzach), 68 B 34 (Evelyn-White), following the words *πνείοντος βορέαο*,

ἔξεσεν δὲ θάλασσα, τρώμεκε δὲ πάντ' ἀπὸ τοῦ.

Where *ἐκξεσεν* (Ludwich), *ζείεσεν* and *ἐξειεν* would equally serve; and Ludwich's *ἐκξεσεν* (cf. Aesch. *Theb.* 709) suggests that here *ἐκζείει*, which deviates very little indeed from *ἐξείει*, is really right. Undoubtedly the present tense suits the passage admirably: 'The dark wave breaks out into foam.'

* * *

46 *εἰ τίς οἱ γαιῶν νίει θέλοι οἰκία θέσθαι.*

This abominable line is a rhapsodist's record failure to reduce to the terminology and metrical ideas of his own day an early epic line which he hoped to improve. Without wasting words on his errors or on modern emendations, of which Franke's *νίει ἐθέλοι* is perhaps the worst, I restore confidently,

εἰ τις γὰρ ἐθέλοι ᾧ νίει οἰκία θέσθαι.

The survival of *νίει* in the dissyllabic form, which is foreign to, and should be excluded from, the early epic, is quite a providential assistance here. It points plainly to the transposition of *νίει* and *ἐθέλοι*, and it is perhaps only necessary to note further that *οἱ* and *ᾧ* are absolutely identical in the older writing.

* * *

53 *ἄλλος δ' οὐ τις σέο ποῦ ᾤψεται, οὐδέ σε λήσει.*

'Ἄλλως = εἰ δὲ μή,' 'otherwise,' 'in the other alternative,' is certainly right, and S (*Codex Vaticanus*) has to its credit the preservation of two correct readings in this line, *ἄλλως* and my old conjecture *λήσει*.

The enclitic *ποτε* occupies a doubtful

position. The verb may indeed have been *προσάψεται*, which gives a better rhythm and perhaps even a better sense if we may judge in any degree from later usage. In later times the short syllable before *πρ*, *τρ*, etc., seems to have been banned (v. *Hymn. Dem.* 203) largely for the older epic; but I cannot digress now to discuss this question at length.

* * *

59 *δημοῦ ἀναίξει, βοσκήσεις θ' οἱ κέ σ' ἔχωσι.*

No line shows more strikingly the value of modern effort to remove the defects of tradition than this. Stoll's *βοσκήσεις θ'* seems to me the only weak point in the restoration. It is not indicated by the tradition, but only by a supposed grammatical necessity that one future indicative should be followed by another. This necessity does not exist. There is a recognised alternative. More than this, the heavy molossus makes the metre halt a little. The peculiarities of the tradition (v. Allen and Sikes)—I spare the reader the detail—seem rather to point to

βόσκησθα δέ χ',

which makes an equally positive affirmation in better metre.

* * *

70 *τῷ ῥ' αἰνῶς δεῖδοικα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν,
μή ὅπότε ἂν τὸ πρῶτον ἴδῃ φάος ἡέλιος
νῆσον ἀτιμήσας, ἐπεὶ ἡ κραναήπεδος εἰμι,
ποσοὶ καταστρέψας ὥση ἄλδος ἐν πελάγεσσιν.*

The second line makes a wonderfully bad hexameter. The first three feet move in this skumble-skamble, lame-duck fashion,

υ υ υ | - υ | - - υ,

to say nothing of the objectionable, ever-intrusive *ἂν*. Read

*μή ποτε τήνδ', ὅτε πρῶτα ἴδῃ φάος ἡέλιος,
νῆσον ἀτιμήσας, ἐπεὶ ἡ κραναήπεδος εἰμι.*

Probably the pronominal article should also be inserted *μή ποθ' ὅ*, but it is not absolutely essential, though it makes the corruption to *ὅποτε* just a letter easier. With *ὅτε πρῶτα* compare *Hymn. Dem.* 86 as briefly restored, *Class. Review*, March, p. 43.

The fourth line requires *ᾧσει* instead of *ᾧση*, not altogether because Delos naturally expresses her fear as a possible issue of the god's displeasure rather

than as an almost certain result, but also because the subjunctive *ῶσθι* in its old epic form *ῶσει* makes the fourth foot nothing but a tribrach. The confusion of subjunctive and optative is by no means rare, e.g. Δ 300; moreover *ῶσει* (H J K At D S) Allen is very significant.

75 κλύσσει, ὃ δ' ἄλλην γαῖαν ἀφίξεται, ἥ κε ἄδη οἱ,
τεύξασθαι νηὸν τε καὶ ἄλσος δενδρήντα.

In the Homer of the Oxford Classical Texts the two commas at the end of l. 75 are removed, which may mean little or nothing. There can be no doubt as to the true reading:

ἥ κε ἄδη οἱ
τεύξασθαι νηὸν

'wherever it may please him to make his temple.' The dependence of *τεύξασθαι* on *ἄδη* is absolutely certain from 220 and 244. In 220 *ὅθι τ' οὐ ἄδε* (M has the elision *τῶ τ' οὐχάδε*, Allen and Sikes, p. xviii) is probable, especially as *τόθι* appears in 244. Here the adverb *ἥ* seems preferable to *ἣ*, though not quite inevitable as appears from 244, which supports both impartially.

81. After the *αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα* ending this line we might have instead of the weak recollection of 75, suggested by Allen and Sikes,

κτῆσάσθω γέρα' ἀφθιτ' ἐπὶ χθονὸς εὐρυδαίης
πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, ἐπεὶ ἡ πολυνέμετος ἔσται,

or simply *χρηστήρι* instead of *γέρα'* *ἀφθιτ'*, with which compare the *δῶρ' ἀμβροτα* of 190, an expression quite admissible here, if it were not fairly certain that we should read there,

ὕμνειονσι θεῶν δῶρ' ἀμβροσί' ἢ δ' ἀνθρώπων
τλημοσύνας. . . .

105 νόσφιν δ' ἥρωγον καλεῖν λευκωλένου Ἥρης. . . .

Philologists have suggested *ἥρωγον* = *ἥρώγεσαν*, but the line might be emended otherwise:

νόσφι δ' ἀνώγεσαν αἱ γε καλεῖν λευκωλένου Ἥρης.

In 102 αἱ δὲ πρὸ Ἴριον ἔπεμψον, and in 106 ἔπειτα ἐπεσσω, may be regarded as certain. *ἔπειτ' ἐπέεσσιν* is unpardonable.

117 ἀμφὶ δὲ φοῖνικι βάλε πῆχες, γούνα δ' ἔρεισε. . . .

This line is one of the strongest fortresses of the defenders of the doc-

trine that the *ι* of the dative singular is long *per se* whenever required to be so. At first sight it would seem to require a high explosive to remove the obstruction. Transposition, however, gives a very effective and successful result:

πῆχες δ' ἀμφίβαλεν φοῖνικ', ἔρεισε δὲ γούνα. . . .

It is merely another case of evading the elision, which had become taboo. We may of course read *ἀμφὶ βάλεν divisim*.

125 ἀθανάτην χερσὶν ἐπήρξατο.

In 1896 I briefly corrected 'Read *χέρσ' ἐπορέξατο*,' merely adding the remark that this elision is a fruitful source of corruption. I had no knowledge then that Ilgen had made the same certain restoration before. Gemoll credits Ilgen with *ἐπώρξατο*, which Doederlein approves for some reason or other, though, as Gemoll remarks, the form is not found anywhere. It is the reading of M, and is the nearest possible approach to the true reading as restored.

Editors are strangely mistaken here. There is no question of libation or of any religious rite or ceremonial observance. We are here concerned solely with the feeding of a baby. The unutterable foolishness of long discussions on *ἀπαρχαί* and *ἐπαρχαί* in connection with drinking and feasting should be patent even to the most learned. There are other occasions, other passages, on which they would be appropriate enough. Here they are decidedly beside the mark.

Unfortunately learned editors know little or nothing about babies. They do not know the procedure commonly followed on such occasions as this. Great-aunt Themis only does what is usually done at the present day under similar circumstances. There is no mystery about the matter, no revelation of anything that could come under the category of

σεμνά, τὰ τ' οὐ πως ἔστι παρὲξ ἐνέποντι πυθέσθαι
οὐτ' ὀχέειν (Hymn. Dem. 478).

A little diluted sugar, the handiest modern equivalent of nectar and ambrosia, is put to the child's lips. The nurse or any relative may play the part of Themis in this kindly service. No

verb could be found to describe the act better than ἐπορέξατο. Nor do I speak without authority and warrant of experience. Αὐτὸς ἐπορεύεσθην.

* * *

151 φάλη κ' ἀθανάτους καὶ ἀγήραος ἔμμεναι αἰεὶ
ὅς τοι' ἐπαντίσσει' ὅτ' ἰάονες ἀθροοὶ εἰεν.

Thus Martin's restoration of 152 is left incomplete and imperfect, for he anticipated by more than 150 years the reading ἀθάνατος of M, which was unearthed in 1777 from its hiding-place in Moscow. Ἀθάνατος restores the possibility of reading also the true old-epic uncontracted form

ἀγήραος.

Now to introduce here ἀγήραος as the equivalent of ἀγήραος might be tolerated as a harmless convention, a concession to later usage; but no such toleration can be extended to this form when it masquerades as the representative of ἀγηράους, an epic metrical impossibility. So in ε 218 σὺ δ' ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήραος would be more correctly read σὺ δ' ἀγήραος ἀθάνατός τε, with this adjective making the dactyl in the fourth place as always; but η 94 should not be read at all save as an interpolation and excrescence, v. *Homerica*, τ 228. On our passage Allen and Sikes, with most infelicitous dogmatism, pronounce that 'there can be little doubt ἀθανάτους is right.'

Well, I venture to hold a different opinion, and would suggest

φαῖτό κεν ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήραος ἔμμεναι αἰεὶ

'he would think that he was an immortal who would grow old no more.'

The sight would be so exhilarating, the pleasure so intense, that he would feel a superhuman exaltation. He would be happy as a god is happy. Sappho expresses the same idea in the opening words of a famous ode:

Φαλνερὰ μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν
ἔμμεν ὦνερ, ὅς τις ἐνάντιός τοι. . .

Whoever turned this fine thought into a puerile and silly compliment to the Ionians, a compliment devoid of all truth and reality, not only wrecked the metre, but showed himself incapable of appreciating a master-stroke of poetry.

Similarly in English, though it may be said of a man that he is in the seventh heaven of delight, this does not mean that he says all the people he meets are saints and angels, cherubim and seraphim. If he did, he would most certainly have to be dealt with by a medical board, and would probably soon find himself in a strait-waistcoat.

The hymn-writer assuredly depicted no such character.

In the last issue, under *H. Dem.* 357, I am made to say mysteriously 'So much for the circumstance.' It should have been 'for the commentators,' i.e. for the defence of ὁφρύσιω commonly found in commentaries.

In *Apoll. Rhod. Argon.* Γ 1025 Seaton reads rightly in the Oxford edition

φαιδρήσιν ἐπ' ὁφρύσι μειδιῶντες,

not ἐπ'. This supports my emendation, which might with advantage be extended to cover or recover Hermesianax in *Athen.* 13, 597 C.

T. L. AGAR.

THE CYRILLUS GLOSSARY AND OTHERS.

THIS article is a sequel to a previous article (*C.R.*, XXXI. 7.) on the Philoxenus Glossary. Its scope is limited to the connexion between the two glossaries and the light thrown by Cyrillus (and kindred collections) on the composition of Philox. In the previous article it was hinted rather than stated that Philox. had been compiled by some monastery-teacher in Italy in some way like this:

I. The compiler went carefully through the standard Latin dictionary, *Festus De Verborum Significatu*, and reduced each suitable lemma to the shortest possible form, a Greek taking the place of the Latin interpretation. He made many mistakes. Sometimes his MS. of *Festus* was at fault; so that e.g. its *aderet* (i.e. *adhaeret*, instead of *aderit*) produced *Adescit*: κολλᾶται, and its *disserit* (a common Italian misspell-

ing of *dixerit*) produced Dicassit: ἐπαγορεύει, συνεχῶς λέγει. Sometimes he misunderstood, and wrote e.g. (105, 30) Comis: κόσμος (cf. Paul. Fest. 55, 28 κόσμος, qui apud nos comis) instead of Comis: ἀστέιος.

II. His monastery-library contained a MS. very suitable to his purpose, a copy of an old Latin-Greek conversation-manual or phrase-book, which had been drawn up for the use of governors of any province where Greek might be needed. It was called *Liber de Officio Proconsulis*; and presumably all its items would be transferred bodily to his pages.

III. Most suitable material was offered by another MS. in the library, a copy of Charisius (or was it a recasting of Charisius?); for in this grammar Latin examples were accompanied by their Greek equivalents. Since there is only one extant MS. of this author, a very defective MS. transcribed at Bobbio about the year 700 (from a S. Italian exemplar, if Beer's bold theory be right), we may glean new details from an investigation of the Charisius items in Philox.

IV. The brief marginal (or interlinear) notes on the text of certain authors (or portions of the text) in the monastery-library offered not only Latin but Greek interpretations. (So the monastery, at least the one where these MSS. were written or annotated, must have contained some or many Greek-speaking monks; presumably a monastery of some part of Italy where Greek survived). The compiler ordered these marginalia to be entered in his glossary. His orders were carried out with more zeal than discretion; for many marginalia which offered no Greek word were extracted along with the others, especially from a text of Horace. In the previous article it was hinted that the MS. used was not of Horace merely, but was rather a *Corpus Saturicorum* including Horace, Persius (cf. 202, 38 with *Schol. Pers.* 1, 82), Juvenal and possibly (but investigation is needed) Sulpicia. Another author was Virgil. Another was Cicero. Others await discovery (e.g. the *Itala*?).

Of the famous Greek-Latin glossary,

known generally, but incorrectly, as the Cyrillus Glossary,¹ we have practically only one copy, an uncial MS. in the Harley collection (No. 5792) at the British Museum; since Goetz (in the preface to Vol. II. of his *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*) has shown conclusively that Laon 444 is a transcript of a transcript of the Harleianus and that the MS. used for Stephanus' edition came from the same source. The Harleianus he has described with conscientious thoroughness on pp. xx ff. of his preface (cf. his article 'Glossographie' in *Pauly-Wissowa*). The Merovingian¹ type of some scribbling at the end proves, as he rightly argues, that the MS. soon found its way to France, but not that it was written there. If we ask 'To what part of France?' no certain answer can be given; but the North is probable. For Nicholas, archdeacon of Liège in the fifteenth century, secured the precious MS. for the library of his birthplace, Cues (near Trèves), and, as we have seen, a transcript of it was at Laon in the ninth century. In fact, the same region seems to have been the home of our unique MS. (now at Paris) of Philox., which comes from the Dupuy library; for M. Dorez tells me that North France was Claude Dupuy's chief hunting-ground for MSS. And in this region it seems possible to connect it definitely with Laon; since Martin the Irishman made with his own hand a transcript (on foll. 306-309 of Laon 444) of a small Septuagint Glossary (discussed in *C.R.*, XXXI. 7.) and added to its A-section excerpts from the A-section of our unique MS. (That it was this actual MS. of Philox. is suggested by the striking similarity between e.g. *C.G.L.* II. 554, 49-50 and 4, 52; 555, 16 and 8, 17). Will some expert in Caroline minuscule tell us whether the Paris MS. of Philox. can have been written in the Laon scriptorium? To the provenance of the Harleianus Goetz provides a slight clue by his remark (*C.G.L.* II. 365, 9 n.) that the scribe, supplying in the margin an omission in the text, has used the

¹ Traube ('O Roma Nobilis,' p. 66 = 362) asks if it is Irish. The answer is 'No.'

symbols *h.d.* and *h.p.* These are favourite Italian symbols. Still, they were not unknown at Corbie, etc. (cf. *Rev. Bibliothèques* 24, 19). At any rate, the glossary itself was not compiled in France; for a Frenchman would have used *plus*, not *magis*, at 319, 30 (Εὐσεβέστερος: *magis pius*), 352, 57 (Κομψότερος: *magis bellus*), 408, 20 (Πιστότερος: *magis fidus*).

Goetz shows that it was compiled from what we may call (1) Greek material, (2) Latin material. To the former class belong items like Ἀβιος: sine vita, Ἀπληκτος: non percussus, etc., where the Greek word dominates; to the second, items like Ὁ πρὸ τῆς παρεμβολῆς τόπος: procastrum, where the Latin claims priority. Anyone who reads through the pages (C.G.L. II. 215-483) with pencil in hand will find that he can at once mark some twenty-five per cent. of the items 'Greek,' some twenty-five per cent. 'Latin,' while the origin of the remaining fifty per cent. must remain doubtful until the sources of the collection have been investigated. This article is concerned only with the 'Latin' items, since these alone can be traced to the Philoxenus Glossary. And one large class of these 'Latin' items may be disregarded, the items culled from Latin Grammars (e.g. Charisius), since they have been investigated in a Jena dissertation (M. Hoffmann: de ratione quae inter glossas graecolatinas et grammaticorum latinorum scripta intercedat. 1907). As example of a Charisius gloss take 355, 43 Κρόταφοι: haec tempora, singulare non habet; Virgilius singulare tempus dixit. It is culled from Charis. *Gram. Lat.* I. 34, 8 (among the Neutra Semper Pluralia): tempora, κρόταφοι; sed Vergilius tempus dixit. (Cf. 367, 1 from Charis. 34, 28; 380, 56 from Charis. 34, 29; etc., etc.)

How greatly Cyrill. can help us in investigating the Festus glosses and the author glosses (from Horace, Virgil, etc.) of Philox. may be illustrated from a puzzling Philox. item which was mentioned in the previous article: 100, 35 Cicutā: κώνειον φάρμακον ἐν τοῖς Βουκολικοῖς καὶ β' Γεωργικῶν. The word occurs twice in Virgil (*Ecl.* 2, 36 septem compacta cicutis fistula; *Ecl.* 5, 85), but

the interpretation φάρμακον would be more suitable to its occurrences in Horace (*Epod.* 3, 3; *Ep̄.* 2, 2, 53) or Juvenal (7, 206; 13, 186). We suspect our (unique) MS. of a very inadequate presentation of the actual item of 'Philoxenus.' Cyrill. confirms our suspicions (337, 19): Κάλamos ἦτοι αὐλὸς ποιμενικός: cicutā; Virgilius in *Bucolicis* (5, 85) 'hac te nos fragili donabimus ante cicutā.' This enables us to reconstruct the original Philox. item so:

ЦИЦУТА: κώνειον φάρμακον (with a Juvenal or a Horace quotation, or both).

ЦИЦУТА: κάλαμος ἦτοι αὐλὸς ποιμενικός (with quotation of Virg. *Ecl.* 5, 85).

It is clear that a detailed comparison of the Virgil glosses of Cyrill. with the corresponding items of Philox. will be a useful work of research. Had the Virgil MS. used by 'Philoxenus' *riguis* at *Geo.* 2, 485? (Cf. 174, 44 *Riguis*: εὐποτίστοις, εὐβώλοις.)

The all-Latin Horace glosses of Philox. sometimes puzzled 'Cyrillus,' e.g. Catella: catena (cf. *Porph. ad Ep̄.* 1, 17, 55 catellam) catenam diminutive). He has made of it (346, 9) Κατήνα: catella. How he has saved for us Festus glosses omitted in the Paris MS. of Philox. we see from e.g. 348, 10 Κεραυνοβόλιον ἡμερινόν: fulgur <d>ium; 348, 11 Κεραυνοβόλιον ἀπὸ πρῶι ἢ νυκτερινόν: fulgur submanum. These two items were culled by 'Philoxenus' from a single lemma of Festus (cf. Paul. Fest. 66 Dium fulgur appellabant diurnum, quod putabant Iovis, ut nocturnum Summani). They have retained their contiguity (even in the strict alphabetical arrangement of this glossary) through the lucky accident that both began with the same word, κεραυνοβόλιον.

To the Cicero glosses from *Catil.* II. of Philox. (mentioned in the previous article) Cyrill. adds e.g. (311, 8) Ἐπιστάσιος: Stator; 'in aedem Iovis Statoris' (Cic. *Catil.* 2, 12). In fact it was from a hint of Cyrill. that Loewe detected the use of the Catilinarian Orations by Philox. With the help of Cyrill. 294, 42 (Ἐλέγχω: ... insimulabo; Cicero III libro Catilinaria 'quae Galli insimulabant negavit') he recognised the source (*Catil.* 3, 12) of Philox. 87, 21 Insimulabant: κατη-

γόρουν. And noticing on this and that page of Philox. the familiar *excessit*, *evasit* and *erupit*, he 'sunk a shaft' at the opening of the second Oration and was promptly rewarded; e.g. *Catil.* 2, 2 *quod vero cruentum mucronem*, ut voluit, *extulit*, quod vivis nobis *egressus est*, quod ei ferrum e manibus *extorsimus*, etc. All these words in italics he discovered in Philox. with a little trouble, while we can find them at once with the help of Goetz' *Thesaurus Glossarum Emendatarum*: (118, 5) *Cruentum*: ἡμαρμένον; (67, 11) *Extulit*: ἐξήνεγκεν, ἐπήνε; (58, 39) *Egressus est*: ὤρμησεν; (67, 1) *Extorsimus*: ἐξετινάξαμεν. On pp. 186-187 of his *Prodromus* he has printed in parallel columns (a) the text of *Catil.* 2, 2-3; 2, 7; (b) the Philox. glosses, some thirty in all, culled from these three paragraphs. This is a sample of how the investigation suggested in the previous article should be carried out. The result will be, I fancy, to show that the Cicero glosses are of a different kind from the Virgil and Satirist glosses, having been culled from a more or less continuous interlinear translation into Greek of portions of Cicero, not from occasional marginal explanations of difficult words in the text.

The investigation may achieve for us the reference of each and every Philox. item to its source; and this new knowledge may have all sorts of consequences. For example, we can trace to Virg. *Aen.* 1, 224 (*mare velivolum*) three Cyrillus items (omitted in the Paris MS. of Philox.): 245, 7; 333, 31; 333, 32. They are 'splits' of an original item transferred from some such Philoxenus item as *Velivolum*: ἰστιοπετές, ἀρμενοπετές. Since ἰστία and ἀρμενα are the stock equivalents of *vela* in bilingual glossaries see *Thes. Gloss.*, s.v.), it is clear what has happened. An Italian monastery-teacher, wishing to explain for Greek students (or students of Greek) the word *velivolum* in a MS. of Virgil, coined and wrote in the margin these two compounds ἰστιοπετές and ἀρμενοπετές, much as we might write in a German reading-book the coined compound 'up-hear' over the German *aufhören*. Liddell and Scott wisely exclude from

their Lexicon such Greek phantom-words that have no existence outside of bilingual glossaries. Similarly, from e.g. *Δυνάστης*: potens (281, 30) and *Πυρσός*: ignis (426, 47) has been coined *πυρσοδυνάστης* to explain the name of Vulcan in *Aen.* 8, 423, etc. Hence (426, 46) *Πυρσοδυνάστης*: ignipotens.

A small part of the A-section (four leaves, according to Goetz) was missing from the Harleianus' exemplar (between 'Αλιξ and 'Ανδράχνη). The *Idiomata Generis* (Nouns of different gender in Latin from Greek), printed by him (*C.G.L.*, II. 487-506) from foll. 241-259 of the Harleianus, are mere excerpts from Cyrill. and therefore as negligible a quantity as the Laon transcript of the glossary. Their *Gnatis*: ὁ γλουτός (493, 16) is not to be taken seriously. It is merely a miswriting from Cyrill. (263, 30) *Γλουτός*: natis, coxa, clunes (cf. 493, 46.). But their *Arbustivum*: ὁ ἐξ ἀναδενδράδων οἶνος (499, 47) seems to preserve an item ('*Αναδενδράς* or the like) of the missing leaves of the Harleianus' exemplar. Their *Assua*: πέταυρον (496, 27) gives no corroboration to Cyrill. 406, 30 *Πέταυρο[ο]ν*: (h)ec assua. Although the *Thes. Gloss.* naturally has to record both glosses, we must remember that they are not two witnesses to the form *assua*, but only one. The true form seems to be *asisua*, since ps.-Placidus found the word (in the Abl. Sing.) in some early writer accompanied by the marginal gloss 'petauro pernice' (*C.G.L.* V. 7, 25 *Asisua*: petauro pernice); and the *Gloss. Nom.* translates (mistranslates) a lost Philox. gloss as (*C.G.L.* II. 568, 23) *Asisua*: fovea (-o) deceptionis animantium (-malium). The papyrus uncial fragment (part of a P-section) at Cologne, printed by Goetz, *C.G.L.* II. 561, supplies a missing word of the Harleianus occasionally, e.g. (397, 26) *Παράφησις* (-ψηφίξω Harl.): <intertrigo>. It is too small to show us whether the glossary which it represents was used by 'Cyrillus' for his 'Greek' items only or for 'Latin' too (e.g. 563, 7 *Πάροδος* πλοίου: agea).

The *Glossae Servii Grammatici* (printed on pp. 507-533 of *C.G.L.* II.) emanate from so late MSS. (saec. x. ex., saec. xii.) that items may have been

raked in from all quarters. It is therefore not impossible that Immussulus: τὸ οἰωνοσκοπικὸν ὄρνειον (515, 5) may come from Paulus' epitome of Festus (3, 11). Still, even these 'suspects' have their value. Offimentum: ἦλος (527, 1) may be the correct form of Philox. 138, 18 Offimentum: πηλός (cf. *fibula* for 'fivibula,' from *fivo* an O. Lat. form of *figo*). Some light might be thrown on the origin of the collection if we could interpret the strange subscription: HUCUSQUE POST MUNUS XII MILIA EXPLICIT FELICITER SERVII GRAMMATICI. Goetz' change of *post minus* to *plus minus* (P' MINUS) seems probable (cf. my 'Notae Latinae,' p. 190). But what of *milia*? The Bâle MS. of Isidore's *Etymologies* (see *Class. Quart.* 5, 51) seems to have taken from some early exemplar the symbol M (μέρος?, μερίς?) to denote 'chapter' or 'section.' Certainly XII M would be taken for XII *milia* by any transcriber. The Glossae Serv. are 'glossae nomenclum.' Is there any connection between their subscription and the title of the all-Latin Glossae Nomenclum: NUNC ALIAE XVI EXIGUAE SECUNTUR?

The Harleian copy of Cyrill., and (if I rightly understand Goetz' account of the four-leaf lacuna in the A-section) also its papyrus (?) exemplar, exhibit a precision of alphabetical order which must be ascribed to 'Cyrillus' himself. (So that the immediate exemplar of Harl. may conceivably have been the actual autograph of 'Cyrillus,' or at least a contemporary copy.) Very different is the alphabetical arrangement in our ninth-century MS. of Philox. Its imperfections and inconsistencies are the result (as was shown in the previous article) of the efforts of successive transcribers, each of whom tried to rearrange while he transcribed. To mediaeval monks a word beginning with ign- was much the same as one beginning with ing-; so at one stage in the transmission of Philox. a score of ign-words (including 79, 60 Ignorat: ἀγνωεῖ) had been left in the IN-section. A subsequent transcriber left them there as he found them (79, 33-60), but (having been instructed to eke out the size of the glossary by double entries, cross-references, etc.) re-entered them

all, one by one, in the IG-section, and made the very natural mistake of writing there the item Ignorat twice (76, 49 and 76, 53). Dammann wrongly uses this repetition of the ign-words as an argument that 'Philoxenus' combined into one two very similar glossaries (compiled from much the same sources). From one of these, he alleges, 'Philoxenus' took the item Ignorat: ἀγνωεῖ, an item culled (let us say) from Virg. *Geo.* 2, 268. From another 'Philoxenus' is supposed to have taken a precisely similar item culled from the same line of Virgil. Dammann explains so the appearance of the item both at 79, 60 and 76, 49, unless I misapprehend him. (He says nothing of its third appearance at 76, 53). This theory that Philox. is a conflation of two glossaries which closely resembled each other I attacked in my previous article, and still have plenty of ammunition if it refuses to surrender. By this reasoning, Dammann would have to pronounce the *Abolita Glossary* to be similarly conflated; also the *Abstrusa Glossary*; most glossaries, in fact. For they too exhibit 'doublets' (often the corrupt and the corrected forms of an item), cross-references, 'splits,' and all the devices by which a transcriber sought to increase the number of items in his glossary. 'Philoxenus' does indeed often exhibit clear cases of two originally distinct items with the same lemma-word, but only when he has culled the word from two different authors (e.g. from Festus and from Horace, *Repotia* 172, 22 and 40).

Am I then arguing that the glossary, as 'Philoxenus' wrote it down, was smaller than the form to which it has expanded in the ninth-century MS.? On the contrary, I believe the original glossary to have been far larger, not merely in the number of items but in their size; in fact, to have been more like the *Liber Glossarum* (apart from its 'gobbets' of Isidore and other Christian writers), even in the marginal labelling of the source of an item, e.g. VERG. *GEO.* II., IUUV., HOR., and (shall we add?) TY (cf. 200, 1) for the paradigm-types. In the first place, our ninth-century MS. has probably omitted much (see the previous article), and so

have previous transcribers. In the second (and this is the main point) the version of the glossary which these transcribers transmitted seems to me to have been a compressed or reduced version. Look at an item like Philox. 182, 46 *Seria: necessaria, σπουδαία, ἀναγκαῖα, πρίων, καὶ μοχλὸς θύρας, καὶ ῥηματικῶς πρίσον*. It seems to me a compression of something like this:

| | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|
| SERIA: necessaria, σπουδαία, | HOR. (with quotation |
| ἀναγκαῖα. | of Sat. 1, 1, 27). |
| SERRA: πρίων. | ? |
| SERA: μοχλὸς θύρας, | ? |
| SERRA: πρίσον. | ? |

And the mere presence of the word ῥηματικῶς is enough to make me refuse to believe that these four items were merged in one by the mechanical process of transcription (e.g. through the omission of all the lemma-words except the first). They must have been deliberately compressed into the reduced form by some 'editor' or (I would rather say) some corrector, the head of some scriptorium who wished to bring the huge bulk of the original and genuine Philoxenus Glossary into handy compass. And the evidence of Cyrillus suggests how very much has been sacrificed in the process, quotations of authors, etc. Investigation will provide material for a more certain reconstruction of the text's history; but I may be allowed to make a mere guess, which will at least show my meaning more clearly. I would guess that, while 'Philoxenus' had arranged his *GLOSSAE PER ELEMENTUM* (cf. 212, 56) by A- (only the first letter of the word

being taken into account), this corrector rearranged them by AB- (e.g. in the A-section, first the ab-words; then the ag-words; then the ad-words; then the ae-words; then the ah-words, if any; then the af-words; then the ai-words; then the ac-words; then the al-words, etc.); and, along with his re-arrangement by AB-, he carried out a sweeping reduction of the size and number of the items. Just as he has betrayed his interference by the word ῥηματικῶς in the item *Seria*, so by the phrase ἐπ' ἄλλῳ 'in another case' in the item *Exacta* (63, 31 *Exacta: ἀνυσθέντα, ἐπ' ἄλλῳ ἀνυσθείσης*). The phrase should not be twisted into the sense 'in another glossary.'

The investigations to which volunteers were invited in the previous article will provide materials for testing this theory. If it stands, then 'Philoxenus' was a mere Italian monastery-teacher, and his Greek must be valued accordingly. His Early Latin words were culled from (1) Festus, (2) *Idiomata* of Charisius, etc. They are often designated by ἀρχ(αίως), e.g. 188, 52 *Stlites: δίκαι ἀρχαίως* (cf. Fest. 411, 1 *stlitem antiqui pro lite dicebant*); and if 'Cyrillus' misunderstood this symbol when he wrote (381, 1) *Οἶνος παλαιός: hoc temetum*, we must read (*Glos. Serv.* 528, 14) *Temetum: οἶνος ἀρχαίως*. Whether any morsels of Greek medical or botanical or ornithological lore survive in any bilingual items, investigations will show. But I greatly doubt it.

W. M. LINDSAY.

VERSE COMPOSITION IN SCHOOLS.

THE art of versification in Greek and Latin—an art which, for the last 150 years at any rate, has been especially English—has for a long time past been compelled to justify its existence as a form of education. Its days of fame are no doubt over. In the golden age of the *Sabrinæ Corolla* and the *Arundines Cami*, its professors may have unduly exalted themselves: they may have forgotten sometimes that their compositions were a means and not an end: at any rate, when some fifty years ago the

battle was first joined between Classical and 'Modern Side' education, verse composition entered upon a period of fiery trial. Satire had already found out the elegant scholar. Those who still read Thackeray will remember his unsympathetic picture of an ex-Fellow, bemused by constant fuddling, yet still able to turn you a copy of Greek iambics, and to consider himself the intellectual superior of those who couldn't. The sporting parson in 'Friendship's Garland,' untouched as he

was by the fierce intellectual life of the century, derived the reputation of a scholar from his celebrated 'copy of longs and shorts on the Calydonian Boar.' Arnold and Thackeray of course knew very well how far they should be taken seriously; but they inevitably provided weapons for the hands of lesser men: the public (naturally thirsting for vengeance on those who seemed to have tortured its youth to no purpose) was apparently invited to conclude, not that the objects of satire did at least possess one redeeming accomplishment, but that Greek iambs had somehow wrecked a promising career, and that Latin elegiacs had completed the brutalisation of the Rev. Esau Hittall. With such great examples in view, it was, of course, the easiest of games for anyone, who liked to see himself printed by the halfpenny Press, to trace national decay to the practice of making Latin and Greek verses—a thing obviously divorced from success in commercial enterprises. Nor was it only the Philistine who was to be feared. There have for long been enemies even in the seats of unpractical learning. Many professed champions of classical studies share the contempt, if not the violence, of the great organs of democracy. Metrical exercises (they say) lack solidity: they are not for the genuine student, they have nothing to do with Research: somehow, their practice is the mark, or even the cause, of an enfeebled mind. Moreover, the female sex, which takes its classical education very seriously indeed, may sometimes condescend to Latin and even to Greek prose: but, for the most part, definitely draws the line at versification.

Such a consensus of opinion is at first sight overwhelming: and the speedy extinction of classical composition, or at least its elimination from respectable curricula, has been confidently predicted by the judicious at any time in the last half-century. Yet somehow it survives, and on the whole flourishes, if not quite with the efflorescence of old days when elegant versification was the supreme achievement of English scholars, and even led to places of emolument. It is of course undeniable that sixth form teachers are not, now, generally selected because they can turn 'In Memoriam'

into alcaics, or Browning into Pindaric Greek. When they are chosen for intellectual qualifications, as is often the case, it is much more likely that they have chronicled a year's work among pre-Minoan relics, or said the last word on the Ravenna MS. of Cluvienus. Such studies naturally avert the mind from metrical *tours de force*—even in places where the great tradition might be supposed to be least assailable. Yet verse-making does still hold its own in public schools. Nor is it nearly extinct at the Universities. The newer seats of learning, indeed, seem to have little time for such toys: but Oxford and Cambridge—till 1914 ended everything for the time—could still show an annual crop of decent versifiers. It was certainly the exception for a candidate to obtain a University scholarship without verses: and even in College scholarship examinations verse-papers were always set, and he who made no attempt thereat was usually expected to justify his existence by possessing some 'extra' qualification, such as a good knowledge of a modern language. In short, to be a versifier made for success. That, in the higher region of Irelands and Hertfords and Cravens, is not surprising. After all, as long as the Classics are studied linguistically, a craft which demands considerable knowledge of a language and considerable power of handling it cannot be neglected. It is not possible to deny the claim of the versifier, as a candidate for prizes which are offered mainly for linguistic knowledge. Prize or not, the scholar who competes creditably in fields like these has attained to a degree of excellence which is in itself worth having. It was worth his while to continue at verse-making, and his existence does not surprise. But, how about the youths who never can attain to these Parnassian heights—who cannot be in the running for classical prizes or scholarships, yet who continue to 'do verses' at school? We are sometimes told by respectable authorities that they ought not so to continue: yet the fact remains that they do. Are we to suppose that they are kept at a much-criticised occupation out of mere conservatism, or to make the running for the budding Jebbs and potential Butlers? Were it not for them, no doubt, the art even in its highest manifestations would

decay. For it is in the field of what is 'recognised as schoolwork' that juvenile excellence is most likely to grow and flourish. Among boys, the solitary striver in a sphere of his own is likely to be at a disadvantage: the potentially brilliant composer needs the stimulus of competition—or at least of a not wholly unintelligent gallery. That is doubtless true. But it is hardly by itself a sufficient reason for keeping the rank and file at their 'longs and shorts,' in the face of so much criticism. Nor can the reason be sought in 'indolent tradition.' Modern teachers of sixth forms in public schools attach little weight to that. It may have been often a *vera causa* down to the end of the last century. But the teacher of these days has passed through the fire of public criticism: it has been forced upon him that he must not follow mere tradition—even if he wished to do so. What he retains, he retains for some other reason than mere conservatism: you may be sure that there is something more than that in it.

There *are* real reasons. The danger is, that in these days schoolmasters may be terrified against their better judgment into disregarding them: and it is a considerable danger: the more considerable, because the reasons for school-boy versification are in themselves good and substantial, being based on human nature. Schoolmasters, as a class, may be credited with knowing their business: if they do not, retribution in some form or other is pretty sure to fall on them. They may be terrorised or cajoled, like anyone else: but even if they follow the worse, as a class they see the better. They know, then, that the boy in the higher forms of schools for whom they make their rules—whom they especially have in view—is neither the exceptional student with real intellectual interests, nor the equally exceptional dunce with none at all. When they frame plans of teaching, it is mainly for the average boy of fairly good abilities. That is a boy to whom not all the manifestations of the Higher Scholarship immediately appeal. His pastors know that he is very seldom really interested and able to profit by hearing literary judgments (I do not say that he has not often a nascent and immature feeling for good literature), or expositions of

archaeological speculations. Very few boys indeed are able to estimate evidence and so appraise at their proper worth theories about the Minoan period or the origin of the Romans. These matters of high dispute will interest some of them later, when they are grown up and able in some measure to judge for themselves: at present, the discussion of such speculations ought to be outside the sphere of school education. It can only be 'got up': and if cramming facts is for the most part an unprofitable business, cramming theories is much worse. So with literary criticism: to invite pupils to admire the beauties of great literature is much more educational for the teacher than for his class: it does not really arouse an intelligent interest in most boys. Literary criticism generally either goes in at one ear and out at the other, or (what is worse) is remembered and repeated by rote. Verse-making, on the other hand, has its genuine attraction for the crowd. What does interest the human boy—in the classical as in every other field—is the feeling that he is making something: in the same spirit in yet earlier years he has built him sand-castles on the seashore, or made some simulacrum of a boat: let the boy have constructed the worst hexameter that ever limped, yet it is his and not another's: a poor thing (he will say) but mine own: it is not as good as the work of Jones major who tried for a Balliol scholarship, nor even as Virgil (at his best); yet it will serve. And if he is trying to make what is better than someone else's, he will be the more likely to use his brains. Moreover, versification is a game which must be played by rules; and boys are great sticklers for the rules of the game: girls, I understand, less so: which may explain the lack of feminine interest in verse-construction.

Hard things have been said about competitive effort. To succeed at the expense of someone else's failure is (we have been sometimes told) anti-social, even brutalising, a reversion to the rule of 'Nature, red in tooth and claw.' When the exponents of the great doctrine of Equality of Opportunity go so far as to say that congenital lack of ability is an unfair handicap, it is clear that they can never be pleased by com-

petitive examinations. What the world will make of these twentieth-century philosophers is not yet clear. For the present it is the undoubted fact that the average boy knows no stronger stimulus to do his best than the battle with a rival: to be matched against a competitor in the business of producing something will incite him to effort when appeals to finer and higher motives leave him cold. Verse-making provides such a stimulus: and this is one reason, I take it, why it is still encouraged by schoolmasters. May one go a step further and claim that schoolmasters may have an answer even for the strictly utilitarian critic who dismisses versification as a thing of no practical value? To such an one they may surely reply, Is there anything more useful in most lines of life than the power of expression: and can this be better taught than by actual practice in the arrangement of the proper words in the proper form? What ever teaches verbal expression is good and useful for the business of life. Students of natural science are beginning to realise that, dimly: they are beginning to see that the reason why they have been comparatively little in demand for administrative posts is not to be sought in mere jealousy or con-

servatism, but in the simple fact that many of them have not been trained in the art of making themselves intelligible. Academic critics, again, might consider whether practice in Greek and Latin versification does not impart some measure of taste and literary judgment. A good teacher will show his pupils more of the essentials of style by the correction of copies of verses than they could ever learn from a course of lectures on the Sublime and Beautiful. Is it not possible that with such consideration in view verse-composition might even compete in utility with some 'modern' subjects? However, perhaps it is too presumptuous to urge that. It would be a dangerous enterprise to suggest that the practice of a delightful art can really compete, as a preparation for the business of life, with a serious training in biology or medieval history. All that the present writer is bold enough to propose is, that when schoolmasters are terrified into throwing some part of their classical curriculum overboard, they should respite verse-making for the moment and jettison something else first. There are several other possible

A. D. G.

REVIEWS

LIVINGSTONE'S DEFENCE OF CLASSICAL EDUCATION.

A Defence of Classical Education. By R. W. LIVINGSTONE. Crown 8vo. Pp. xi+278. London: Macmillan. 4s. 6d. net.

THIS singularly able and timely book is planned as follows: Ch. I., Introduction, pp. 1-20; ch. II., Physical Science and the Humanities, pp. 21-54; ch. III., The Case for the Classics: Greek, pp. 55-122; ch. IV., The Case for Latin, pp. 123-153; ch. V., Some Educational Advantages of the Classics, pp. 154-208; ch. VI., The Case for Grammar and Prose Composition, pp. 209-237; ch. VII., Reforms, pp. 238-278.

The scheme adopted involves, as perhaps any scheme would, some repe-

tition. But the reader's interest is held from beginning to end. He feels he is listening to a man who knows his case, believes in it, and can present it with power and charm. The case urged is not that of the mere bookman or antiquarian. Two ancient peoples, and their civilisations, are shown to deserve and demand the study of the modern world. The Greek passion for truth and beauty, and the Roman genius for government, are brought home to our business and bosoms in vivid English. No candid and right-judging reader can fail to see in the book itself the evidence of an education befitting a modern citizen who, in times of fundamental change, looks forward as well as back-

ward, backward as well as forward. The volume ought to be read and re-read, not only by those who are most closely interested, whether as defenders or assailants, in the future of classical studies, but by all who wish to gain a true view of a training that, at its best, is hard indeed to beat.

Mr. Livingstone himself is, wisely, a critic as well as a defender. In the space at my command I am unable to quote even one or two among the many radiant passages of defence found throughout the book. Nor is it worth while to set down here those slips and misprints which seem inevitable in a work of any range. I shall rather ask some questions suggested by the zeal which the author shows for the improvement of classical education, for its successful resistance to any excessive claims on the part of physical science or the modern languages, for its extension to all classes of the community, and for its future generally.

When one of the stock objections to Greek and Latin as taught in secondary schools is the great number of hours often demanded for their study, should not some mention be made of the 'Direct Method,' whose supporters maintain that they secure as good or better results in fewer than the customary hours and can thus find time for the most comprehensive modern education? And might not more be said about other novel methods of kindling interest among schoolboys and parents?

Other questions arise in connexion with the urgent contemporary demands for the extended teaching of physical science and modern languages; and there is need of the most punctilious fairness within the various camps. Is it, after all, correct to say that 'the great gap in [physical] science is that it tells us hardly anything about man (p. 30)'? Again, does not Mr. Livingstone, when dealing with Greek and Latin prose composition, seem to undervalue the training in the art of writing that can be obtained through the modern languages? It is true that, if translating into Greek or Latin such expressions as 'religious education' or 'a romantic woman' or 'the personal element' (pp. 231-3), you would be driven to

paraphrase them and so to clear up their meaning. But I am not so sure that, in all these three cases, a good teacher of French would accept from a pupil a quite literal rendering.¹ And, granted that it is easier to glide along unthinkingly when translating into modern languages than when translating into Greek and Latin, the question remains whether a good standard of English writing cannot be reached (and in less time) along other than the old classical paths. The ancient Greeks were excellent writers, though they knew no language but their own. We cannot doubt that to-day they would, with their innate love of knowledge and comparison, study all the other tongues they could find time for. But in the best age of Hellas a monoglot Greek prose-writer was too much of a thinker and an artist to turn out anything like that 'woolly bit of English'—a choice specimen of English *κωινή*—which Mr. Livingstone (p. 225) quotes, with the above description, from a newspaper 'leader.' And, given a good teacher practised in the art of writing, might not a monoglot Englishman, without knowing even those French classics which every modern writer should try to know, learn to shun such 'woolly bits' of English?

It is a misfortune to appear even for one moment to underrate the educative powers of the great modern languages and literatures once they have behind them, as the ancient classics have, the experience of many generations of teachers and learners. On the side of subject-matter, in which Mr. Livingstone goes so far as to say (p. 235) that his whole interest lies in regard to Latin and Greek, the new schemes for the Cambridge Modern and Medieval Languages Tripos suggest the rich treasures that await the learner, when the great works that have stood the test of time are read in preference to the latest success of the hour and when with the study of a language there always goes the study of a people. For boys of a

¹ It seems a mistake to set a limit to the improvement possible in the teaching of one's own subject or any other. Why, for instance, should it be assumed (p. 22) that 'few boys will learn at school to talk fluent French and German'?

special kind I firmly believe that there is no training which so greatly shapes mind and character as that given by Greek and Latin, and in every large secondary school I would have a picked class of Grecians. But modern languages also offer ample scope for able pupils, and we must resist any temptation to capture all the promising boys. Entrance scholarships at the universities should often be awarded on a combined ancient and modern course, and the scholars be left free to pursue either ancient or modern languages, or (best of all) to take one set of studies after or along with the other.

Mr. Livingstone is rightly anxious that, at the proper time, the balance should be shifted from formal training to the contents of the classics. 'When we have to teach young men of eighteen and over, if we still lay the chief emphasis on grammar, composition and scholarship, we have ignored the development of their minds and interests, and forgotten to change their mental food (p. 246).' The criticisms passed by many gifted men upon classical education as practised in their own youth come to mind, and A. H. Clough's undergraduate lament at Oxford may be cited as typical: '*Quousque* Latin Prose?' It is just the most vigorous minds that suffer most through so much stale repetition, and through the lack of fresh manly work to be done for the love of it.

Although Mr. Livingstone is so much of a reformer that he would find a place for science in the Oxford Greats School (p. 20), he says little about the claims of classical archaeology, and seems occasionally (pp. 84, 170) to take insufficient account of its modern results. But a brief tribute (pp. 70, 71) to Greek Art shows that he is the last man to be blind to that glorious aspect of Greek civilisation.

Contrasting German with English universities, Mr. Livingstone says that the classical student generally leaves the latter without the idea of advancing knowledge ever having occurred to him (p. 17). This is, I hope and believe, an overstatement. If it were strictly true, classical study would seem to have

much to answer for. The advancement of knowledge is only one side of university life, but it is absolutely essential. And it would be a grave indictment of any study to imply that, whatever the reason, it failed to quicken the spirit of inquiry and the desire for modest creative effort. If such a spur is needed, a good plan would be to make, as here (pp. 17, 18) suggested, a piece of original work a necessary qualification for high honours. There would be abundance of subjects. The ancient classics are no worked-out field: witness the Greek literary papyri, Strabo, the Anthology, or the almost countless openings for literary and historical comparisons between ancient and modern writings.

Lastly as to the prospects, local and general, of classical education. Towards the end of his book Mr. Livingstone asks, 'If such misconceptions [as some he has just mentioned] prevail in trees that are comparatively green, what will be found among the dry timber of business men in Leeds or Bristol or Gloucester, who have never had occasion to think at all deeply about education? What chance will Greek have with them? (p. 273).' So far as the attitude of Leeds business men towards Greek is concerned, it can be said with truth that they have shown themselves not unwilling to learn; and this is praise that anybody might feel proud to deserve. It is not so long since the University of Leeds was the Yorkshire College of Science, with a distinct bias towards Applied Science. When Arts subjects were first added, it was in the form of what one might call 'Applied Arts.' The object of the Yorkshire College of Science had been declared to be 'to supply instruction in those sciences which are applicable to the manufactures, engineering, mining, and agriculture of the County of York; also in such arts and languages as are cognate to the foregoing purpose.' Yet Ancient Greek, a language of little direct use in the intercourse of modern traders and manufacturers, is now open to any student of Leeds University who desires to take it, whether at a lower stage in connexion with other subjects or as an integral part of a course in Classical

Honours.¹ It is quite possible that, among the less receptive Leeds citizens, one here and there may be inclined to say in words which I vary slightly from those used by Mr. Livingstone (p. 273): 'Greek is a dead language; you might as well learn Egyptian or Icelandic.' But the antidote for this is to be found in such *Defences* as the present one, whose influence will be felt through many channels. Our young classical graduates and lecturers, though free, I hope, from any irritating 'Arts-man, preamble' spirit, are well able to repel ill-based attacks; and they will now have fresh weapons in their armoury.

With regard to the general outlook for classical study any attempt at prophecy would be more than usually hazardous. In his introductory chapter Mr. Livingstone has justly declined to be deterred from quoting German educational experience by any fear of exciting prejudice. As he hints, a sedulous attention to both classical and scientific training has helped to make Germany strong; and her present excesses are the outcome of 'a maniacal nationalism' (p. 3), usurping the place of that truly human civilisation which is the legacy of Greece and Rome, and inspired by an autocrat who has shown himself no

friend to the time-honoured classical culture. The possibility of a new barbarism posing as a new civilisation, and defending itself on the ground of patriotism, was pointed out fourteen years ago by Professor Percy Gardner in a striking passage of his *Oxford at the Cross Roads* (p. 70). Now that the blow has fallen, we can only hope that, at least among those countries, including America, which delight to dwell on the traditions that tend, however imperfectly, to keep alive some sense of unity in Europe, there will be a redoubled effort to study the long growth of international relations, and to seek, by exploration in classic lands released from alien sway, for new light upon dark chapters in Mediterranean history. If, finally, the ancient classics are, as we all desire, to remain something greater than a mere department of learning—if they are to play a substantial part in the life-training of some among the best of our younger people—they must be studied and taught by men, like the author of this book, whose interest in the living past is rooted in the living present, and who wholeheartedly believe in the inherent liberality and nobility of classical education. ὅτι μὲν τοίνυν ἐστὶ παιδεία τις ἦν οὐχ ὡς χρησίμην παιδευτέον τοὺς νείεις οὐδ' ὡς ἀναγκαίαν ἀλλ' ὡς ἐλευθέριον καὶ καλὴν, φανερόν ἐστιν.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

Leeds University.

PLAUTUS.

Plautus. With an English translation by PAUL NIXON; Vol. I. (*Amphitryon*, *The Comedy of Asses*, *The Pot of Gold*, *The Two Bacchises*, *The Captives*); Loeb Classical Library. Published by Heinemann and J. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916.

A NEW translation of Plautus by a competent scholar is an event to be hailed with gratitude; and there can be no doubt of Professor Nixon's competence. He not only commands an idiomatic and nervous style of English, but he has hit the right tone, and in difficult passages he shows that he has studied Plautus as

a scholar. We have recently had an excellent verse translation of five plays (three of them being included in Professor Nixon's list) by Sir Robert Allison (1914); but a prose translation offers better opportunities for reproducing the exact shade of meaning in the original.

A good average specimen of Professor Nixon's work is *Capt.* 461-497; the passage is too long to quote here. But the only words which strike me as capable of improvement are 'egoists' (477 *sese amant* 'they are selfish') and 'foreign law' (492 *barbarica lege* 'Roman law'; this seems to me more humorous as well as more exact). One of the most touch-

¹ It should be added that the University Council has given liberal support to Roman excavations in Yorkshire, and has taken much interest in the local branch of the Classical Association.

ing passages in Plautus (*Asin.* 539 ff.) is well translated as follows: 'Even the shepherd that pastures other peoples' sheep has some ewe lamb of his very own, mother, one that he builds happy hopes on. Do let me love Argyrippus alone, the man I want, just for love's sake.' But it is in the humorous passages that Professor Nixon is most successful, for example, *Asin.* 5 'and be sure you put that in the bill' (*cave modo ne grutiis*), 264 'there are rods in pickle for me' (*mihi in mundo sunt virgae*); *Aul.* 156 'her wedding to-morrow, and her wake the day after' (*cras veniat, perendie foras feratur*), 202 'to make a deal with me' (*meum adire ad pactonem*), 260 'now it's on and now it's off' (*pactum non pactum est*), 304 'his lower windpipe' (*inferiorem gutturem*); *Bacch.* 51 'the limed twigs are brushing my wings' (*harundo alas verberat*), 537 'we must have a dinner' (*cena detur*); *Capt.* 121 'how about my giving you — the slip?' (*mene vis dem ipse in pedes?*), 150 'he was my only only' (*unico magis unicus*), 153 'commissary department' (*edendi exercitus*), 182 'An estate indeed! You mean an empty state' (*profundum vendis, haud fundum*), 189 'things that root in the earth' (*terrestris*).

The text adopted is that of Leo—probably the most suitable for the purposes of this translation. Where Leo's text is not accepted a brief critical note is given, e.g. *Aul.* 562, where *curiosam* is rightly accepted from Prescott (*Class. Phil.* II. p. 335 f.); but then the reading in the next line should be *curion* (not *curio*). It is almost a pity that Professor Nixon did not avail himself more often of the liberty of departing from Leo's text, e.g. in *Amph.* 314 f., where *pessume est* and *facimus* are clearly wrong; in *Amph.* 930 Leo is wrong in suspecting the MS. reading, which, however, he does not go so far as to call 'corrupt' (as Professor Nixon's note makes him call it); in *Asin.* 558 there is no reason to depart from the MS. reading *virtutes qui tuas nunc possis conlaudare?* 'how should you be able now to praise your valorous deeds, as I can your misdeeds?'; in *Capt.* 682 and 690 Leo's punctuation can hardly be right, but in any case the translation in 690 does not reproduce the text.

In some passages I think Professor

Nixon goes astray. For example, *ut* hardly means 'according as' in *Amph.* 1; in *Aul.* 756 *ego habeam potissimum* means 'I in particular should have her'; in *Bacch.* 425—434 the subjunctives are not adequately rendered (see my 'Unity of the Latin Subjunctive'); in *Capt.* 70 'I feel called upon to be with 'em' does not represent *invocatus soleo esse in convivio*, in *Capt.* 1000 *demum* does not appear in the translation.

I hope that Professor Nixon may translate the other plays in successive volumes. It may, therefore, be worth while to indicate some of the passages in which I personally think his translations might be improved: *Amph.* 31 f., 166 ('nabob' has wrong associations), 170 ('plutocrat'), 375 ('by limitation', cf. 845), 395 ('be thrashed to you'), 521 ('henchman'), 705 ('it will be bad humour'), 722 ('apple supply'), 741 ('that would do you good'), 813 (omit 'am'), 839 f. ('personally I do not feel' is hardly in the right key, and 842 is not well rendered); I see no reason why *quid hoc sit hominis?* should not be similarly translated in 576 and 769; *Asin.* 40 ('hawk it way up! Is this an Americanism for 'hawk away!?''), 61 ('we get plenty of it for 'we come into the reckoning''), 177 (perhaps the ? is a misprint), 203 ('there's no getting—you know what'), 680 ('watch me', cf. 145); *Aul.* 20 ('so he also died', *nam item obiit diem*), 41 ('with your prying and spying'—too free), 110 ('I'm sure they would' for *credo*), 167 ('ladies of high station' for *magnas factiones*), 297 ('you could not squeeze as much out of that old chap as you could out of a pumice stone'), 371 f. ('to be hearty to-day and do the handsome thing'); *Bacch.* 242 ('shear off his gold'—better 'fleece him of his gold'), 939 ('he has a Bacchis with him; that one of old had a fire'—better 'Bacchis is his flame'), 962 ('who captures cities with no weapon save his mighty tongue'—better 'with his mouth', *verbis*); *Capt.* 14 ('bursting myself'), 29 ('for'), 57 ('unprincipled'), 61 ('imposition'), 109 ('so full of food I was fairly tipsy'), 160-4 (the modern names, for which the translator craves pardon in his note, are not really effective), 193 ('how low it is'), 569 ('unearthed'), 578 ('Freeman'), 617 ('the axe and the altar'), 709 ('atrocious',

pessume), 881-3 (the modern cities seem pointless), 1026 ('and him a heavier slave' is not very clear, though probably rightly meant; read 'your son' for 'him').

Two characteristic Plautine expressions I find inadequately translated in some passages: *mira sunt ni* in *Amph.* 283, and *mirum quin* in *Amph.* 750 and *Aul.* 85.

I regret that the translator has divided his plays into Acts; this is, of course, unplautine and it is not warranted by Leo's text. Moreover, it is inconsistent with the numeration of the lines given

in the margin. The references to Acts and Scenes ought to have been made only in the top margin.

The Index seems to have been made mechanically, perhaps by someone else; hence entries like *Parmenos*, *Syruses*.—In *Aul.* 327 is the lamb led? I thought it was a dead lamb. I doubt also whether parenthetical remarks like 'Prologue laughs uproariously at his pleasantry' are in place. The joke is, no doubt, a poor one (*Capt.* 1 f.); but it is not necessary to rub this in.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

SHORT NOTICES

Seneca's Tragedies. Translated by FRANK JUSTUS MILLER. Loeb Classical Series. Two vols. Heinemann.

WHETHER we read Seneca's tragedies or not (and perhaps few do), the fact remains that no student of English literature can neglect an author who exercised so potent an influence on our own drama. The great Elizabethans, it need hardly be said, did not go direct to Greece for their models. What they knew of Greek tragedy they learnt for the most part from 'Senek,' as Skelton calls him; and there is much in his manner and method that could not but appeal to English audiences. 'Moral edification,' it has been said, 'is dear to the heart of the British public, and violent and bloody actions are still dearer.' Both kinds are in Seneca's plays. He moralises from start to finish, and his descriptions are as gruesome as any playgoer could desire. But, like so much of Silver Age literature, he is best read, not from cover to cover, but in extracts. That continual succession of thrust-and-parry repartees in the stichomuthia, and (worse) those page-long ostentations of gratuitous erudition which clog and hamper the most emotional scenes, are really beyond the power of the most omnivorous reader. There is too much learning, and a superfluity of rhetoric. These, as his translator truly says, were 'the faults of his age—an age when form, when rhetorical devices, when mere

locution had come to be magnified unduly.' If they must always have spoiled the plays for the stage, they do at least serve a purpose by illustrating the literary tendencies of the first century. In this respect again it is impossible to overlook the importance of Seneca (as a tragedian) in literature.

Mr. Miller, therefore, is entitled to our gratitude; and he has come well equipped to the task of translation. He knows all that there is to know about Seneca: he has already published a metrical version of the tragedies. The present version is faithful and scholarly. Perhaps the most obvious criticism of Mr. Miller's style is that he cannot quite escape (as is natural enough) from his own previous performance, and is continually dropping into a metrical form. Excellent trisyllable lines and Alexandrines are frequent: there are whole long passages which, with the slightest change of words here and there, would make quite good blank verse. This occurs so often that it can scarcely be unintentional. Every man to his taste; but certainly the best prose avoids blank verse. Inevitably the recurrence of such appears to argue, as Mr. Saintsbury says, 'a certain poverty in rhythmical resources.' Yet it may be said, on the other hand, that a style so artificial as Seneca's can hardly be separated from metrical form: that his balanced *sententiae* almost require something more regular than mere licentious prose.

A. D. G.

OBITUARY

PROFESSOR JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE.

PROFESSOR JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE of Harvard was known in this country not merely through his books; he was frequently in Europe, and both in England and in Italy his genial humour and his enthusiasm for exact scholarship had won him many friends, especially, perhaps, among Cambridge men. In the closing years of his life he undertook service of the most generous kind to the *Classical Quarterly* while it was edited by Dr. Postgate, and subsequently to the Classical Journals Board. When the Journals became the property of the Board, new arrangements were necessary with Messrs. Ginn and Co. for the American sale; and it is hardly too much to say that the system which was adopted after considerable thought and correspondence, and which appears to have given complete satisfaction both to American readers of the Journals and to our American publishers, could not have been developed without the patient and quite devoted help of Professor White, who gave continued attention to the practical problems involved for some three years. Readers of the Journals will be glad to add this to the other debts of gratitude which they owe to a personality of singular power and charm.

Professor Williams White's main work in scholarship was on Aristophanes, and his contributions to the criticism of this author include minute study of the manuscripts, the text, the scholia, and the metres.

He was largely responsible for the production of the facsimile of the *Codex Venetus Marcianus* 474, which was published in 1902 by authority of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies and of the Archaeological Institute of America, of which he was then President. At the time there was some doubt as to whether it would not be more immediately useful to reproduce the older, more famous and, from the point of view of the palaeographer, the more interesting *Codex of Ravenna*. It was felt however by many, who were

warmly supported by White, that the Ravennas was certain sooner or later to be included in Sijthoff's great series of facsimiles; and that the collations of the Ravennas were of good quality, especially the collation of the scholia made by Hans Graeven for Rutherford's edition published in 1896. The *Venetus*, while acknowledged to be a document of high authority, was imperfectly known; Von Velsen's collations were only available for the text of the few plays which he had published, and the current text of its important scholia was most untrustworthy. It is no reproach to the earlier collators to say this. For the *Venetus* is a hurried and mechanical transcript of an older book and is difficult to decipher, especially in the scholia, owing to the mass of ligatures and compendia which the scribe employs. No eye could stand the strain of continuous collation. A typical instance of what could happen can be seen in Plutus 1016, where the old reading of the scholion ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ διαγράφεται can now be correctly read as ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τῆς γραῶς δηλονότι.

The expectation that the Ravennas would be reproduced by Sijthoff proved to be well founded, and since 1904 students of Aristophanes have been able to consult at their leisure the two main authorities for the text, and are now freed from the constant uncertainty which beset editors before that date. In 1903 White himself began a transcript of the Venetian scholia on the *Aves*, which he published in 1914. It is a work of the highest value, well fitted to serve as an introduction to the study of the tradition of classical texts and of the methods and terminology of scholiasts. White no doubt intended that it should serve this purpose. For his elaborate and accurately executed scheme of literal transcript, emended text, minute collations of other manuscripts, together with explanatory notes, could hardly require to be extended to the scholia of all the plays.

While engaged on this elaborate work

he found time to compile his Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Aristophanes, which he published in 1906 in a series of articles in *Classical Philology*. This presents an accurate census of the two hundred and forty (or more) MSS. of Aristophanes, and contains a discussion of the critical use of the MSS. and of the sigla employed to designate them. It is a most valuable piece of work, and is indispensable to any one working on the text of Aristophanes. He also found time to write his work on *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, which appeared in 1902. This is more than its title implies. It is really an exhaustive treatise on Greek metre in general, since most Greek metres are illustrated in Aristophanes. The book deals with the origins and laws of metre, making full use of the comparison with the metres of the Veda and the Avesta, and summarises and at the same time advances the recent theories on this most important and most difficult subject. When we consider the vigour and the enthusiasm for research which he maintained unabated long after he had retired from his active work as a teacher we cannot but regard it as a happy omen for the future of classical scholarship in America. The valuable work on Greek Comedy done by his colleagues and pupils, such as Professor Capps and Dr. Cary, shows that his influence is not likely to be soon forgotten.

A. E. CODD.

By the early death, at the age of thirty-five, of Professor Alfred Emlyn Codd, M.A., classical study has been robbed of a promising investigator and eloquent defender; and classical teaching in Canada—indeed, in the Empire—has suffered a serious loss.

Professor Codd was a pupil of the late Mr. James Waugh at the Higher Grade School, Cardiff, where he passed to the University College of South Wales, taking his degree with First Class Honours in Latin in 1903, and

after two years as Assistant to Professor R. M. Burrows in the Greek department, he obtained an Open scholarship at Lincoln College, Oxford, where, if I may be allowed to record it, he was a favourite pupil of Dr. Warde Fowler. He was placed in the First Class of Classical Moderations and the Second Class of *Literae Humaniores*, and was then appointed classical lecturer in University College, Aberystwith, passing to the University of Manchester as a Senior Assistant lecturer in 1911, and from thence to the Chair of Latin in Queen's University, Kingston, Canada, on Professor Anderson's appointment to the Chair of Imperial Latin at Manchester.

Mr. Codd was thus known in five different colleges, and everywhere left the same impression of a deeply sincere and unselfish nature, devoted to his work, and, when his teaching began, to the good of his pupils.

His four years in Canada were sadly broken by the approach of the malady, to which, after a long struggle, he succumbed on October 5. But he had been long enough at work to win the warmest confidence of his colleagues and pupils, whose admiration and regret have been publicly expressed by the Principal of the University.

Mr. Codd's contribution to classical study is represented, in print, only by a brief Vergilian note in this Review, Vol. XXXI. (1917), p. 22, but he had for many years made a study of the Roman occupation of Great Britain, especially with a view to forming some picture of its religious side. His collection of material was not far advanced when his last illness began.

He will be mourned by all who knew him, not least by those who have had the privilege of knowing how rich a contribution his generous nature was making to the humane interpretation of the great ancient poetry, especially that of Vergil, which he supremely loved.

R. S. C.

Manchester,
November, 1917.

NOTES AND NEWS

At the meeting of the Northumberland and Durham Classical Association in Newcastle on November 3, the Rev. H. K. Mann, D.D., read a paper on 'A Medieval Terence: Hrosvitha,' in which he discussed the dramas of the nun of Jandersheim and illustrated their contrast in aim and in style with those of Terence. Dr. Mann read his own translation of *Abraham*, as perhaps exemplifying her powers at their best. Dr. J. Wight Duff, who presided, contrasted Hrosvitha not only with Terence but with Schoon ('Schonaeus'), whose six Latin plays in the sixteenth century

blended biblical and pagan elements in a manner typical of the Renaissance. Canon Cruickshank spoke of certain peculiarities of Hrosvitha's style and grammar, and mentioned that some of her dramas had been represented in recent times at Paris. Canon Paterson suggested the possibility of the influence of Hrosvitha's *Abraham* on an incident in Charles Reade's *Cloister and the Hearth*; and Mr. Basil Anderton spoke of the recovery of the manuscript of Hrosvitha's plays and referred to the allegation that they were forged.

EPITAPH ON AN ARMY OF MERCENARIES.

THESE, in the day when heaven was falling,
The hour when earth's foundation fled,
Followed their mercenary calling
And took their wages and are dead.
Their shoulders held the sky suspended;
They stood, and earth's foundations stay;
What God abandoned, these defended,
And saved the sum of things for pay.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

From 'The Times,' October 31, 1917.

Εἰς μισθοφορικὴν τινα στρατιάν.

Μισθοφόροις πίπτοντα πόλον σχέθον οἶδε χέρεσσι,
σῇ τε διὰ σφείας γαῖα σαλευομένη·
ἦν γὰρ καθάνατοι τάξιν λίπον, ἐξεφύλαξαν,
πάντα δὲ σώσαντες μισθὸν ἔχουσι μέρον.

J. M. EDMONDS.

CORRESPONDENCE

AN unfortunate error has been pointed out to me in my paper on 'Duplicated Altars and Offerings in Virgil' which appeared in your last issue (p. 165). In the *Cenotaphium Pisanum* there quoted there is no mention of such duplication; BOS ET OVIS ATRI means that the victims were one black ox and one black sheep.

The blunder does not seriously affect my argument in the paper; but the middle paragraph on p. 165b must be considered as cancelled.

Yours faithfully,

W. WARDE FOWLER.

Kingham,

November 22.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Allen (J. T.) *The First Year of Greek*. 7½" × 5". Pp. 375. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917. Cloth, \$1.30.

Browne (H.) *Our Renaissance: Essays on the Reform and Revival of Classical Studies*. 8½" × 5½". Pp. xvi + 281. London: Longmans, 1917. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Charles (R. H.) *The Book of Jubilees; or, The Little Genesis. Translated from the Ethiopic text (Palestinian Jewish Texts)*. 7½" × 5". Pp. 224. London: S.P.C.K., 1917. Cloth. 4s. net.

Cruickshank (A. H.) *The Future of Greek*. 9" × 5½". Pp. 25. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1917. 1s.

Lingua Latina. Secundus Annus. By C. L.

Mainwaring and W. L. Paine. 7½" × 5". Pp. 101. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1917. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

Loeb Classical Library. Dio's Roman History, Vol. VI. (E. Cary), pp. vi + 492. Plutarch's Lives, Vol. V. (B. Perrin), pp. x + 544. The Greek Anthology, Vol. III. (W. R. Paton), pp. iv + 456. Plautus, Vol. II. (P. Nixon), pp. xii + 487. 6½" × 4¼". London: W. Heinemann, 1917. Cloth, 5s. net each.

Sturtevant (E. H.) *Linguistic Change: An Introduction to the Historical Study of Language.* By E. H. S., Assistant Professor of Classical Philology in Columbia University. 7½" × 5¼". Pp. x + 184. University of Chicago Press, 1917.

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

A.

- Abbott (E. A.)**, a misplaced epithet in the Gospel, 153 ff.
Acta Fratrum Arvalium, 166
Aeschylus' Persae, some *crucies* of, 113 ff.
Agamemnon, notes on some lines in the, 20
Agar (T. L.), the Homeric Hymns, 40 ff., 65 ff., 117 ff., 185 ff.
 Aix, Roman remains at, 106
 Alcaeus, the Berlin, again, 9 ff., 33 ff.
Allbutt (Clifford), notice of Brock's *Galen on the Natural Faculties*, 100 ff.
 ambrosia, 5 f.
 annotated school classics, 155 ff.
Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum, noticed, 141 f.
Appleton (B. B.), Annotated School Classics, 155 ff.
 notice of Walters, Conway and Daniel's *Deigma*, a first Greek book, 103 f.
 Apuleius, the life and works of, 28
 Aristophanes, MSS. of, 202 f.
 Aulis, the assembly at, 7 ff., 37 ff.
 Ausonius, *Mosella* (378 sqq.), note on, 135

B.

- Bailey (Cyril)**, notice of Ernout's *Lucrece de la Nature: Livre Quatrième*, 175 f.
 bathos, 21 f.
 Belisarius, 54
 Bevan's *Towns of Roman Britain*, noticed, 146 f.
 Boas, *University Drama in the Tudor Ages*, noticed, 27 f.
Books Received, 32, 64, 112, 152, 184, 204
 Botsford and Sihler's *Hellenic Civilisation*, noticed, 61
 Bouchier's *Spain under the Roman Empire*, noticed, 29
 Bourne's *A Study of Tibur, Historical, Literary, and Epigraphical*, noticed, 106 f.
 Bridges' *Ibant Obscuri, an Experiment in the Classical Hexameter*, noticed, 73 ff.
 Broch's *Galen on the Natural Faculties*, noticed, 100 ff.
Brodrick (C. W.), Classical metres for English poetry, 124 f.
 Bronze Age, identification by Virgil with the 'Age of Saturn,' 20
Burrows (Ronald M.), notice of Botsford and Sihler's *Hellenic Civilisation*, 61
Butterworth (G. W.), notice of Dewing's *Procopius*, 53 ff.
 notice of Perrin's *Plutarch's Lives*, 55 f.

C.

- Caesar, a misunderstanding of, 21 f.
 (See Vol. XXX., p. 189, Vol. XXXI., p. 21.)
 Caesar's censure of Terence, 21 f.
 Calverley's translations, 74 f.
 Cambridge, plays produced at, in the Tudor Age, 17
 Camilla, 16
Carnoy (Albert T.), some *crucies* of Aeschylus' *Persae*, 113 ff.
 'Cataloguer' of the *Iliad*, The, 37 ff.
 Cedalion, 170b
 'Cenotaphia' of Pisa, the, 165b
 Charisius, 159a, 189a, 190a
 Cicero, the tribe of, 31, 61
 Cicero's argument in *Pro Balbo* VIII. (19 sqq.), 132 ff.
 Classical metres for English poetry, 73 ff., 123 ff.
 Clerc's *Aquae Sextiae*, noticed, 106 f.
 Cocchia's *Romanzo e Realta nella vita e nell' attivita letteraria di Lucio Apuleio*, noticed, 28
Codd (A. E.), notes on Professor Phillimore's emendation of Virgil, *Ecl.* IV. (61), 22 f.
 obituary notice of, 202
 Consular Provinces between 67 and 52 B.C., 11 ff.
Conway (R. S.), notice of Darnley Naylor's *More Latin and English Idiom*, 43 ff.
 obituary notice of A. E. Codd, 202
 the Poet of Italy, 16 ff.
 Conway's *Falernian Grapes (Uvae Falernae)*, noticed, 30
Cooke (Harold P.), notes on some lines in the *Agamemnon*, 20
Correspondence, 63 f., 112
 Culex and Pastor (on Propertius IV. 10), 126 f.
 Cyrillus Glossary, the, and others, 188 ff.

D.

- Darnley Naylor's *More Latin and English Idiom*, noticed, 43 ff.
 Davis (A. H.), *Caesar and the Germans*, noticed, 147b f.
 Davis (Gladys), *The Asiatic Dionysus*, noticed, 136 ff.
 Dewing's *Procopius* (Loeb Classical Library), noticed, 53 ff.
 Diogenes Laertius, notes on, 97
 double sacrifices, 166 ff.
 duplicated altars and offerings in Virgil, *Ecl.* V. 65; *Aen.* III. 305; and *Aen.* V. (77 sqq.), 163 ff.

E.

- Edmonds (J. M.)**, the Berlin Alcaeus again, 9 ff., 33 ff.
 Greek version of Housman's *On an Army of Mercenaries*, 204
English hexameters, 73 ff.
 poetry, Classical metres for, 73 ff., 123 ff.
Enoch of Ascoli, 178a
Epictetus, Arrian's interpretation of, 173
 New Testament correspondences with, 174
Erasistratus, 101b
Ernout's *Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin*, noticed, 56 ff.
Lucrèce de la Nature: Livre Quatrième, noticed, 175 f.
Etyma Latina, 128 ff.
Euripides, *Bacchae* (504 sqq.), 135a.
Euripos, the, 7 ff.
Evelyn White (Hugh G.), the Heliconian Prelude to the Theogony, 157 f.
Hesiod: *Works and Days* (455 sqq.), 68b f.
 note on Ausonius, *Mosella* (378 sqq.), 135 f.

F.

- Ferguson (A. S.)**, notes on Diogenes Laertius (I. 104; I. 77), 97
Festus glosses in a Monte Cassino MS., 130 ff.
Food of the Gods, the, 4 ff.

G.

- Gabinus and Piso**, recall of, 11 ff.
Galen, 100 ff.
Gammer Gurton's Needle, 27
Garrod (H. W.), notice of Housman's *Manilius*, Book III., 107 f.
Gaselee (S.), notice of Cocchia's *Romanzo e Realta nella vita e nell' attivita letteraria di Lucio Apuleio*, 28
 notice of Veniero's *Paolo Silenziario*, 58 f.
Glossary, the Cyrellus, and others, 188 ff.
 the Philoxenus, 158 ff.
glosses, *Catullus* II., 162b
 Horace and Virgil, 161
 Juvenal, 162
Godley (A. D.), verse composition in schools, 193 ff.
 notice of Miller's *Seneca's Tragedies*, 201 f.
Goodrich (W. J.), on the prospective use of the Latin imperfect subjunctive in relative clauses, 83 ff.
Gospel, a misplaced epithet in the, 153 ff.
Granger (Frank), the influence of the imperative on Latin idiom, 47 ff.
 notice of Davis' *The Asiatic Dionysus*, 136 ff.
Greek, general relative clauses in, 69 ff.
 nouns, primitive, 4 ff.
 question, the: a lesson from Scotland, 71 f.
 words beginning in 'αμ', 6b
Grenfell and Hunt's Oxyrhynchus Papyri (Part XII.), noticed, 104 f.
Gudeman's P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus, noticed, 176, ff.

H.

- Hardy (E. G.)**, Cicero's argument in *Pro Balbo* VIII. (19 sqq.), 132 ff.
 Consular provinces between 67 and 52 a.c., 11 ff.
Harrower (J.), the Greek question: a lesson from Scotland, 71 f., 121 f.
Haverfield (F.), notice of Bevan's *Towns of Roman Britain*, 146 f.

'Head of John the Baptist, the,' some remarks on, 1 ff.

(See also pp. 63 f.)

- Henry's Aeneidea**, quoted, 17, 164b
Herophilus, 101b
Hesiod: *Works and Days* (455 sqq.), 68 f.
Homer, English translations of, 73 ff.
 Homeric Hymns, the, 40 ff., 65 ff., 117 ff., 185 ff.
 honorific names of months, 30b
 Horatian construes, two, 52 f.
Housman's Manilius, Book III., noticed, 107 f.
Howe (J. C.), μελανοσώματος, 135b
Hutchinson (W. M. L.), notice of Sandys' *Odes of Pindar*, 98 ff.

I.

- Ideas**, 'earlier Platonic theory of,' 70
 Idiom, more Latin and English, 43 ff.
 imperative, influence of the, on Latin idiom, 47 ff.

J.

- James (M. R.)**, some remarks on 'the Head of John the Baptist,' 1 ff.
Johnson, Martin, and Hunt's *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Rylands Library at Manchester*, noticed, 30
Jones (H. Stuart), notice of Bonchier's *Spain under the Roman Empire*, 29
 notice of Bourne's *Study of Tibur and Clerc's Aquae Sextiae*, 106 f.
Juno in the *Aeneid*, 17

K.

- Keyes' Rise of the Equites in the Third Century of the Roman Empire**, noticed, 59 ff.

L.

- Latin imperfect subjunctive**, on the prospective use of, in relative clauses, 83 ff.
Leucas—Ithaca, 97 f.
lex Clodia, 12b
lex Sempronia de provinciis consularibus, 11
Lindsay (W. M.), the Cyrellus Glossary and others, 188 ff.
 Etyma Latina, 128 ff.
 Festus glosses in a Monte Cassino MS., 130 ff.
 Philoxenus glossary, the, 158
 notice of Ernout's *Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin*, 56 ff.
Little Iliad, the, 168b, 170a
Livingstone's A Defence of Classical Education, noticed, 196 ff.
Livy, order of words in, 43
Lothian (Alex.), translations, 148
Lucilius, 57
Lucretius' construction of compound verbs, 176a
 formation of abstract nouns, 176a
 peculiar use of *ab*, 176a
 use of infinitive or genitive of gerund after substantival phrases, 176b

M.

- Marchant (E. C.)**, notice of Rasi's *Bibliografia Virgiliana*, 147
Mason (W. A. Parker), notice of Sharp's *Epictetus and the New Testament*, 173 ff.
Matthew Arnold on translating Homer, 73 f.
Miller's Seneca's Tragedies (Loeb Classical Library), noticed, 201 f.
Moulton, James Hope, obituary notice of, 108 ff.
Munro (J. A. B.), notice of *Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, 141 f.
 nectar, 4 f.

N.

- Neptune, the name, 17b
Nixon's *Plautus*, Vol. I. (Loeb Classical Library),
noticed, 199 ff.
Norwood (G.), the ascent of Olympus, 139 f.
NOTES, 52 f., 97 ff., 135
NOTES AND NEWS, 110 f., 148 ff., 204

O.

- OBITUARY, 62, 108, 202 f.
Olympus, the ascent of, 139 f.
ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS, I ff., 33 ff., 65 ff., 113 ff.,
153 ff., 185 ff.
Oxford, plays produced at, in the Tudor Age, 18
OXONIENSIS, Classical metres for English poetry,
73 ff., 126.

P.

- Palladium, theft of the, 171a
Parentalia, 164
Paton's *The Greek Anthology* (Loeb Classical
Library), noticed, 142 ff.
Paulus Silentiarius, 58 f.
Peake (Arthur S.), obituary notice of James Hope
Moulton, 108 ff.
Pearson (A. C.), notice of Porter's *the Rhesus of*
Euripides, 25 ff.
Pearson's *The Fragments of Sophocles*, noticed,
167 ff.
Perrin's *Plutarch's Lives* (Loeb Classical Library),
noticed, 55 f.
phantom words, Greek, 191
Phillimore (J. B.), further remarks on Propertius,
86 ff.
a misunderstanding of Caesar, 21 f.
Virgil, *Ecl.* IV. (62), 23 f.
Poet of Italy, the, 16 ff.
Pollock (Frederick), two Horatian construes, 52
Porter's *the Rhesus of Euripides*, noticed, 25 ff.
Powell (J. U.), notice of Paton's *The Greek Antho-*
logy, 142 ff.
Propertius, dogmatic diviners and, 86 ff.
Pyrrhus, inscription on votive offering of, at
Tarentum, 31
'quantitative verse,' 77 ff.
QUERIES, 31, 61

R.

- Rasi's *Bibliografia Virgiliana*, noticed, 147
Reid (J. B.), notice of Keyes' *Rise of the Equites in*
the Third Century of the Roman Empire, 59 ff.
Queries, 61
REVIEWS, 25 ff., 53 ff., 98 ff., 136 ff., 167 ff., 196 ff.
Rhys Roberts (W.), notice of Livingstone's *A*
Defence of Classical Education, 196 ff.
Richards (G. C.), Leucas—Ithaca, 97 f.
notice of Pearson's *Fragments of Sophocles*,
167 ff.
obituary notice of Robert Whitelaw, 62
Richmond (O. S.), Culex and Pastor (on Proper-
tius IV. 10), 126 f.

- Rouse (W. H. D.), notice of Boas, *University Drama*
in the Tudor Ages, 27 f.
notice of Bridges' *Idant Obscuri*, 144 ff.
notice of Conway's *Falernian Grapes (Uvae*
Falernae), 30
notice of Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus*
Papyri, 104 f.
notice of Johnson, Martin, and Hunt's *Cata-*
logue of the Greek Papyri in the Rylands Library
at Manchester, 30

S.

- Sandys' *Odes of Pindar* (Loeb Classical Library),
noticed, 98 ff.
Sargeant (John), Classical metres for English
poetry, 123 f.
Sharp's *Epictetus and the New Testament*, noticed,
173 ff.
Shewan (A.), the Assembly at Aulis, 7 ff., 37 ff.
Smith (J. A.), General Relative Clauses in Greek,
69 ff.
Solomon (Lawrence), note on Euripides, *Bacchae*
(504 sqq.), 135a.
Sonnenschein (E. A.), the authorship of *Vivat Rex*
Optimus, 52b, f.
notice of Nixon's *Plautus*, 199 ff.
Sophocles, the lost plays of, 168 ff.

T.

- taboo on horses, 17b f.
Tacitus' *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, fifteenth century
MSS. of, 178b
Theogony, the Heliconian Prelude to the, 157 ff.
TRANSLATIONS: *Anth.* V. (169), 148
Tydeus, cannibalism of, 171a
Tyrrell's emendations of the Homeric Hymns,
66 f.

U.

- Ufens, 18b

V.

- Veniero's *Paolo Silenziario*, noticed, 58 f.
Verse composition in schools, 193 ff.
VERSION, 204
Virgil, *Ecl.* IV. (61), notes on Professor Phillimore's
emendation of, 22 f.
Ecl. IV. (62), 23 ff.
Vivat Rex Optimus, the authorship of, 52b, f.

W.

- Walters, Conway and Daniel's *Deigma, a first*
Greek book, noticed, 103 f.
Warde Fowler (W.), duplicated altars and offerings
in Virgil, *Ecl.* V., 65; *Ann.* III., 305; and
Ann. V. (77 sqq.), 163 ff.
Warde Fowler's *Virgil's Gathering of the Clans*,
noticed, 16 ff.
White, Professor, obituary notice of, 202 f.
Wight Duff (T.), notice of Gudeman's *P. Cornelii*
Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus, 176 ff.
Wright (F. A.), the Food of the Gods, 4 f.

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

- A.
- Aeschylus:—
Ag. (50, 119), 20; (137, 180, 449, 552, 640), 21a
Eum. (925), 6a
Persae (8 sqq.), 113 ff.; (27 sq.), 115 f.; (135 sqq.), 116; (656 sq.), 117; (875 sqq.), 116 f.
- Aristophanes:—
Knights (1095), 6a
- Asconius:—
in Pisoniam. (2), 12a
- C.
- Cicero:—
pro Clu. 15 (45), 83, 85b f.
de Imp. Cn. Pomp. 9 (22), 83, 85a
de Or. i. (167), 83 f.
Phil. II. 15. (37); III. 4 (11), 83, 85a
de Rep. I. 18. (285), 83 f.
Tusc. Disp. 2. (48), 171a
- D.
- Diogenes Laertius:—
 I. (77, 104), 97
- E.
- Euripides:—
Hipp. (136), 6a
Medea (982), 6a
Rhesus (54, 105, 251, 446, 805), 26a; (364, 737, 270, 268, 110, 436, 538, 546, 781, 191, 374, 875), 26b
- H.
- Hesiod:—
Theog. (1-35), 157 f.
Works and Days (455 sqq.), 68 f.
- Homer:—
 II. II. (301 sqq.), 37b; (360 sqq.), 37a; V. (777 sq.), 5b; XIV. (170), 5b
Od. IV. (445), 5b; XIX. (165 sqq.), 38a; XXII. (62), 6a
- Homeric Hymns:—
Apoll. (20, 27), 185; (46, 53), 186a; (59, 70), 186b; (75, 81, 100, 105, 106, 117), 187a; (125), 187b; (151), 188
Dem. (40), 117 f.; (258), 118a; (285, 289, 291, 300), 118b; (313), 119a; (325), 119b; (332, 357), 120a; (371, 383, 426, 428), 120b; (312), 66a; (342), 65; (366), 66a; (369), 66a; (12 sqq.), 66; (17), 67a; (137), 67a; (144), 67a; (53), 67b f.; (168, 223, 279), 68b; (387 sqq.), 40 ff.; (54 sqq.), 41 ff.; (64, 66, 75, 76, 86, 87), 42b, f.
- Horace:—
A.P. (120), 52a, b
Epp. I. xiv. (39), 24a; II. ii. (159), 52a
Odes I. (x.), 24a
- L.
- Livy:—
 I. 6 (3), 83, 85; 48 (7), 83 f.; II. 16 (3 sqq.), 19b; V. 20 (10), 83, 85; VI. 35 (3), 83, 84a; XXI. 42 (2), 83; XXXIV. (c. 4, 4, c. 5, 11), 44
- Lucretius:—
 IV. (206, 752 coll. III. '531, 823), 175b; (1152), 176a; (1237), 176b
- N.
- New Testament:—
 St. Luke vii. (2), 153 ff.
- P.
- Pindar:—
Ol. II. (116), VI. (60), VII. (5), 99b
Pyth. III. (20), 99b; IV. (227), 100a
Nem. V. (40), VI. (25 sq.), 100a.
- Plato:—
Phaedrus (247E), 5b
Rep. X. (596A), 69 ff.
- Plautus:—
Amph. (314 sq., 930), 200a
Asin. (558), ib.
Aul. (562), ib.
- Propertius:—
 III. xiii. (39), 87
- Q.
- Quintilian:—
Inst. Orat. IX. iv. (23), 21b
- S.
- Sophocles:—
Fr. (45), 6a; (851, 911, 953), 168b; (2, 4, 9, 11, 14, 565, 20, 22, 24, 25), 169b; (23, 33, 40, 43, 93, 11), 169b; (144, 150, 153 sq., 149, 557, 198, 187), 170a; (78, 272, 281, 277, 286, 334, 336 sqq.), 170b; (367, 368, 799, 370, 371, 390, 391, 395, 401, 411, 442, 574 sq.), 171a; (453 sq., 482, 497 sqq., 502 sq., 522, 523, 524, 526, 887, 563 sqq., 582 sqq., 654), 171b; (652, 660, 658, 686 sq., 696), 172
- T.
- Tacitus:—
Agr. 43 (3), 83, 86b
Ann. XIV. (37), 60b f.
- Theocritus:—
Id. XV. (108), 6a
- V.
- Valerius Flaccus:—
Arg. IV. (493 sqq.), 22b
- Virgil:—
Aen. I. (543, 808), 18a; III. 300 sqq., 164b; V. (42 sqq.), 164; (639), 167b; VI. (848 sqq.), 18a; VII. (601 sqq.), 16 f.
Ed. I. (69), 24b; IV. (61), 22b, (62), 23 f.; V. (66), 164a, 165
Georg. I. (318 sqq.), 43b, f.

III.—INDEX VERBORUM

A.—GREEK.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|----|-----------------------------------------|----|
| ἀ ἀθροιστικόν, 6b | A. | κελίβηρες, 24a | K. |
| ἀμβροσία, 5b, f. | | | N. |
| ἀνατέλλω, 5b | | μελανοσύρμοις, 135b | |
| ἀντί, 'for the sake of,' 174b | | | O. |
| ἀνωθεν, temporal, 174b | | ὀρολοποιεῖν, 114b, f. | |
| ἀπολύομαι, 153 f. | | ὀψάρις, 30b | P. |
| βαύζω, 113b, f. | B. | παραλυτικός, 135b | |
| βρότῃρες, 36b | | πατροκτόνος δίκη, 172b | |
| γαστριμαργος, 99a | Γ. | προσερχομαι with dative of person, 175a | |
| | | πᾶσα, 41a | Σ. |
| δίαίτα, 99b | Δ. | στάζειν, 171a | Τ. |
| ἐκεῖ, 'thither,' 174b | E. | ὑπατος, 20 | Φ. |
| ἐντιμος, 153 | | φιλότιμος, 30b | Ω. |
| ἐξαμβρόσαι, 6a | | ὥστε, final, 175a | |
| ἐπικαμπύλα, 69b | | | |
| ἐρωή, 119a | | | |

B.—LATIN.

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------------|----|-----------------------------------|----|
| āpricus (?), 93a | A. | imbuere exemplum (?), 88a | I. |
| arces (Virgil), 20a | | insequi, 88b | |
| asisua, 191b | | | M. |
| astare with acc., 89b | | macror, construction of, 22a, 46b | |
| bono publico, 45b | B. | | N. |
| cicuta, 190 | C. | neptu (Umbrian), 17b | P. |
| clausa, 86 f. | | balma, 'victory,' 88b | |
| cotis, 159b | | personarum acceptio, 163a | |
| crucior, discrucior, construction of, 22a | | praeses, 60a | |
| | E. | primipilaris, 154b | |
| egregium publicum, 45b | | ridere, 23b, f. | R. |
| fandi as genitive of fas, 18a | F. | volaret, 18a | V. |
| Fescenninus acies, 20a | | vokorum nuncupatio, 166 | |

COLLEGE SERIES OF GREEK AUTHORS

FEW editions equal the attractiveness of this Series in scholarship, in clear typography, and in durable and pleasing binding. There are introductions and commentaries which provide the student with every reasonable assistance to the fullest appreciation of the various works, while the large clear Porson type helps make the task of the reader the more enjoyable.

ÆSCHINES AGAINST CTESIPHON. Edited on the Basis of Weidner's Edition, by R. B. RICHARDSON. 279 pages. 6s. net.

ÆSCHYLUS: PROMETHEUS BOUND. With the Fragments of the "Prometheus Unbound." With Introduction and Notes by N. WECKLEIN. Translated by F. D. ALLEN. 178 pages. 6s. net.

ARISTOPHANES: CLOUDS. Edited on the Basis of Koch's Edition, by M. W. HUMPHREYS. 252 pages. 6s. net.

EURIPIDES: BACCHANTES. Edited on the Basis of Wecklein's Edition, by I. T. BECKWITH. 146 pages. 5s. 6d. net.

EURIPIDES: HIPPOLYTUS. Edited by J. E. HARRY. xlv+175 pages, illustrated. 6s. net.

EURIPIDES: IPHIGENIA AMONG THE TAURIANS. Edited by I. FLAGG. 197 pages, illustrated. 6s. net.

GREEK DIALECTS, INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE. With Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Charts, Map, and Glossary by C. D. BUCK. 319 pages. 12s. 6d. net.

HOMER: ILIAD. Books I.-III. Edited on the Basis of the Ameis-Hentze Edition, by T. D. SEYMOUR. 235 pages. 6s. net.

HOMER: ILIAD. Books IV.-VI. Edited on the Basis of the Ameis-Hentze Edition, by T. D. SEYMOUR. 213 pages. 6s. net.

HOMER: ILIAD. Books XIX.-XXIV. Edited on the Basis of the Ameis-Hentze Edition, by E. B. CLAPP. 441 pages. 7s. 6d. net.

HOMER, INTRODUCTION TO THE LANGUAGE AND VERSE OF. By T. D. SEYMOUR. 104 pages. 3s. 6d. net.

HOMER: ODYSSEY. Books I.-IV. Edited on the Basis of the Ameis-Hentze Edition, by B. PERRIN. 229 pages. 6s. net.

HOMER: ODYSSEY. Books V.-VIII. Edited by B. PERRIN. 186 pages. 6s. net.

LUCIAN: SELECTED WRITINGS. Edited by F. G. ALLINSON. xlii+265 pages. 6s. 6d. net.

LYSIAS: EIGHT ORATIONS. Edited by M. H. MORGAN. liii+223 pages. 6s. net.

MENANDER, FOUR PLAYS OF. Edited by E. CAPPS. x+329 pages. 10s. 6d. net.

PAUSANIAS: ATTICA. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Plans, and Excursions, by M. CARROLL. 293 pages. 7s. 6d. net.

PLATO: APOLOGY OF SOCRATES, AND CRITO. With Extracts from the *Prædo* and Symposium, and from Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. Edited by L. DYER. Revised by T. D. SEYMOUR. With Vocabulary. 246 pages. 6s. 6d. net.

PLATO: GORGIAS. Edited on the Basis of Deuschle-Cron's Edition, by G. LODGE. 308 pages. 7s. 6d. net.

PLATO: PROTAGORAS. Edited on the Basis of Sauppe's Edition, with Additions, by J. A. TOWLE. 179 pages. 5s. 6d. net.

SEPTUAGINT: SELECTIONS. (According to the Text of Swete.) Edited by F. C. CONYBEARE and ST. GEORGE STOCK. 313 pages. 7s. 6d. net.

SOPHOCLES: ANTIGONE. Edited on the Basis of Wolff's Edition, by M. L. D'OOGHE. 196 pages. 6s. net.

THUCYDIDES. Book I. Edited on the Basis of Classen's Edition, by C. D. MORRIS. 349 pages. 7s. 6d. net.

THUCYDIDES. Book III. Edited on the Basis of Classen's Edition, by C. F. SMITH. xi+320 pages. 7s. 6d. net.

THUCYDIDES. Book V. Edited on the Basis of Classen's Edition, by H. N. FOWLER. 213 pages. 6s. net.

THUCYDIDES. Book VI. Edited on the Basis of the Edition by Classen-Staup. By C. F. SMITH. 250 pages. 6s. 6d. net.

THUCYDIDES. Book VII. Edited on the Basis of Classen's Edition, by C. F. SMITH. 202 pages. 6s. net.

XENOPHON: HELLENICA. Books I.-IV. Edited on the Basis of the Edition of Büchschütz, by J. I. MANATT. xxiii+286 pages. 7s. 6d. net.

XENOPHON: HELLENICA. Books V.-VII. Edited on the Basis of the Edition of Büchschütz, by C. E. BENNETT. 240 pages. 6s. net.

XENOPHON: MEMORABILIA. Edited on the Basis of the Breitenbach-Mücke Edition, by J. R. SMITH. xix+270 pages. 6s. 6d. net.

Text Editions in paper covers may be had separately, price 2s. net each

GINN AND COMPANY, PUBLISHERS.
9, ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON, W.C. 2.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

A History of Ancient Coinage, 700-300 B.C.

By PERCY GARDNER, Professor of Classical Archaeology in the University of Oxford. 8vo., with 11 plates. [Shortly.]

Authoritative works in the history of ancient coins have hitherto traced that history only in relation to minting states and cities taken one by one. The present work is an attempt to trace the course of coinage through four centuries as a continuous development in relation to the political and commercial history of the Mediterranean countries.

The Descent of Manuscripts.

By A. C. CLARK. Royal 8vo.

[Shortly.]

CONTENTS.—Omissions in MSS.; Omission Marks, etc.; The Evidence of Marginalia; Primasius on the Apocalypse; Ciceronian Palimpsests; Cicero Philippics; Verrines; Oratt. Post Reditum, etc.; Pro Fonteio, Pro Flacco, etc.; De Natura Deorum, etc.; Asconius and Pseudo-Asconius; The MSS. of Plato; The Paris MS. of Demosthenes.

From the Preface.—"The general object of this book is to show how internal evidence furnished by MSS. can be utilized to shed light upon the filiation of codices, and in some cases upon the archetype from which they are derived; also to apply such knowledge to the criticism and emendation of the text."

Studies in the History and Method of Science.

Edited by CHARLES SINGER. With illustrations in colour and black and white. Crown 4to. 21s. net.

The Contents include: The Scientific Views and Visions of St. Hildegard (1098-1180), by CHARLES SINGER; A Study in Early Renaissance Anatomy, with a new text: the Anothomia of Hieronymo Manfredi (1490), by CHARLES SINGER; and the "Tractatus de Causis et Indiciis Morborum," by REUBEN LEVY.

Ciceronis Orationes.

Verrinae sc. Divinatio in Q. Caecilium in C. Verrem Actiones II recognovit W. PETERSON. Editio altera recognita et emendata 1917. Cloth, interleaved, 8s.; cloth, 4s.; paper cover, 3s. 6d.

[Oxford Classical Texts.]

Homeri Opera.

Recognoverunt D. B. MONRO et T. W. ALLEN. Five volumes. Tomus III Odysseae Libros I-XII continens recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruit T. A. ALLEN. Editio altera 1917. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 3s.; paper cover, 2s. 6d.; interleaved cloth, 5s. 6d. [Oxford Classical Texts.]

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.

Edited by a Committee of the Classical Instructors of Harvard University. Volume 28. Medium 8vo. 6s. 6d. net.

CONTENTS: On the Second Book of Aristotle's Poetics and the Source of Theophrastus' Definition of Tragedy, by A. P. McMAHON.—Chaucer's Lollus, by G. L. KITTEDGE.—A Study of Exposition in Greek Tragedy, by E. SPRING.—Summaries of Dissertations for the Degree of Ph.D., 1916-17.

Pictetius.

The Discourses and Manual, together with fragments of his Writings. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by P. E. MATHESON. Fcap. 8vo. 2 vols. 3s. 6d. net each.

[Oxford Library of Translations.]

Ibant Obscuri.

An experiment in the classical Hexameter. By ROBERT BRIDGES. 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.

Ingram Bywater.

An Oxford Scholar. By W. W. JACKSON. With a portrait in photogravure. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

Times.—"We know not if this admirable little monograph on one of the most learned and brilliant Hellenists that modern Oxford has produced will attract many readers among the general public. The life, aims, and achievements of the classical scholar are perhaps caviare to the general. But we cannot doubt that all who have known Oxford and its academical life during the later decades of the last century and the first decade of this will heartily welcome the book and read it with keen appreciation. Dr. Jackson is singularly well qualified for the task he has undertaken. He has produced a masterpiece of its kind."

Christianopolis.

An ideal state of the Seventeenth Century. Translated from the Latin of JOHANN VALENTIN ANDREAE, with an Historical Introduction by F. E. HELD. Crown 8vo., with three illustrations. (Germanic Literature and Culture—a series of monographs.) 5s. net.

[Oxford University Press: American Branch.]

Plato's Biography of Socrates.

By A. E. TAYLOR. Royal 8vo. 2s. 6d. net.

[British Academy.]

Greek Civilization as a Study for the People.

By W. RHYS ROBERTS. Royal 8vo. 1s. net.

[British Academy.]

A Greek Reader for Schools.

Adapted from Aesop, Theophrastus, Lucian, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, edited with introductions, notes, and vocabularies, by C. E. FREEMAN and W. D. LOWE. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d.

Studies in Dante.

Fourth Series textual criticism of the *Convivio* and Miscellaneous Essays. By the late Canon MOORE. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

Italy and her Invaders.

By T. HODGKIN. Vols. V. and VI. (The Lombard Invasion and Kingdom). Reprinted with notes by the author, incorporated by R. H. HODGKIN. 8vo. 36s. net the 2 vols.

LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD. Oxford University Press, Amen Corner, E.C. 4.

